

JRC SCIENTIFIC AND POLICY REPORTS

# Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF)

## Evaluation of 2014 MS DCF Annual Reports & Data Transmission (STECF-15-13)

Edited by Cristina Castro Ribeiro & Arina Motova

This report was reviewed by the STECF during its 49<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting  
held from 6 to 10 July 2015 in Varese, Italy

Report EUR 27410 EN

European Commission  
Joint Research Centre (JRC)  
Institute for the Protection and Security of the Citizen (IPSC)

Contact information  
STECF secretariat  
Address: Maritime Affairs Unit, Via Enrico Fermi 2749, 21027 Ispra VA, Italy  
E-mail: [stecf-secretariat@jrc.ec.europa.eu](mailto:stecf-secretariat@jrc.ec.europa.eu)  
Tel.: 0039 0332 789343  
Fax: 0039 0332 789658

JRC Science Hub  
<https://ec.europa.eu/jrc>

#### Legal Notice

This publication is a Science and Policy Report by the Joint Research Centre, the European Commission's in-house science service. It aims to provide evidence-based scientific support to the European policy-making process. The scientific output expressed does not imply a policy position of the European Commission. Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission is responsible for the use which might be made of this publication.

JRC 96975  
EUR 27410 EN  
ISBN 978-92-79-50554-6  
ISSN 1831-9424  
doi:10.2788/069049

Image on page 8 © belongs to Polish National Marine Fisheries Research Institute - (Morski Instytut Rybacki - PIB )

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2015

© European Union, 2015

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged

#### How to cite this report:

Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) Evaluation of 2014 MS DCF Annual Reports & Data Transmission (STECF-15-13) . 2015. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, EUR 27410 EN, JRC 96975, 287 pp.

Abstract : The Expert Working Group meeting of the Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries EWG 15-10 was held from 22 –26 June 2015 in Gdynia to evaluate MS Annual Reports for 2014, the MS's data transmission to the end-users over 2014 and to identify actions to improve these exercises in the future. At the end 23 ARs were evaluated, 813 data transmissions issues from nine end-users were assessed and judged and the future actions were identified. The EWG report was reviewed by the STECF plenary 15 -02 held from 6 to 10 July 2015 in Varese (Italy).

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Request to the STECF .....	5
Expert Working Group EWG-15-10 report.....	8
1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	9
2 INTRODUCTION.....	12
2.1 Terms of Reference for EWG-15-10.....	12
2.2 Structure of the report .....	13
3 PRE-SCREENING EXERCISE.....	13
4 ToR 1 - Evaluation of Member States Annual Reports for 2014.....	14
4.1 Setting the scene.....	14
4.2 Results .....	17
4.2.1 SUB GROUP 1 .....	19
4.2.2 SUB GROUP 2 .....	21
4.2.3 SUB GROUP 3 .....	23
4.2.4 SUB GROUP 4 .....	24
5 TOR 2 - EVALUATE MEMBER STATES TRANSMISSION OF DCF DATA TO END USERS IN 2014 .....	26
5.1 Setting the scene.....	26
5.2 Results .....	28
6 TOR 3 - ANALYSIS OF THE ANNUAL REPORT AND DATA TRANSMISSION EXERCISES.....	29
6.1 Feedback to the end-users about the data transmission feedback to the Commission in future. .....	29
6.1.1 Timeliness .....	29
6.1.2 End-user feedback to MS .....	29
6.1.3 Formulation of end-user feedback.....	29
6.1.4 Data call in relation to data collection and international agreements .....	30
6.1.5 Data omissions .....	30
6.1.6 Other topics .....	30
6.2 Recurring issues arising in several Member States, relating to data collection or transmission. .....	31
6.2.1 Member States:.....	31
6.2.2 Actions for the Commission: .....	32
6.3 Member State-specific issues relating to data collection or transmission which should be addressed to ensure that end users receive the data they need .....	32
7 TOR4.....	32

7.1	New Annual Report & STECF Evaluation Templates.....	32
7.1.1	Evaluation templates: .....	32
7.1.2	The Data Transmission It Platform, Derogations Lists, And Other Tools Provided By The Commission.....	33
7.1.3	Pilot project to produce AR Standard Tables for the 2014 Annual Report: .....	33
7.1.4	Macro Exercise:.....	34
8	CONTACT DETAILS OF STECF MEMBERS AND EWG-15-10 List of Participants	35
9	List of Annexes .....	39
10	List of Background Documents.....	39
	Annex 1 – Agenda.....	41
	Annex 2 – Template .....	42
	Annex 3 – Annual Report Assessment.....	45
	Annex 4 – Data transmission assessment.....	156
	Annex 5 – ToR 3.3 MS feedback on Specific Issues .....	260
	Annex 6 – Comments/feedback from pre-screening .....	277
	Annex 7 – Compilation of Comments/suggestions by MS .....	284

# **SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND ECONOMIC COMMITTEE FOR FISHERIES (STECF)**

## **Evaluation of 2014 MS DCF Annual Reports & Data Transmission (STECF-15-13)**

### **THIS REPORT WAS REVIEWED DURING THE PLENARY MEETING HELD IN**

**VARESE ITALY, 6-10 JULY 2015**

#### **Request to the STECF**

STECF is requested to review the report of the STECF Expert Working Group meeting, evaluate the findings and make any appropriate comments and recommendations.

#### **Background**

The STECF Expert Working Group (EWG) 15-10 met in Gdynia, Poland, 22-26 June 2015, to assess Annual Reports (AR) of 23 Member States (MS) for 2014, submitted as part of the Data Collection Framework. For evaluation and approval of the outcomes of the MS' National Programmes (NP), the European Commission is consulting STECF about the execution of the NP and about the quality of the data collected by MS in accordance with Articles 7.1 and 7.2 of Council Regulation 199/2008.

In addition, the EWG 15-10 was requested to evaluate the level of compliance of the DCF Data Transmission (DT) by MS to the end-users in 2014. The EWG assessed the feedback from nine end-users: ICES, GFCM, ICCAT, JRC, DG MARE, IOTC, IATTC, WCFCP and the Regional Coordination Meetings (RCMs). This feedback was available via a new online platform set up by JRC.

ARs and DT issues were assessed by a group of pre-screeners before the EWG meeting. The pre-screening effort has been increased compared to previous years: The number of pre-screeners has been doubled and the most complex AR modules have been assessed by two pre-screeners simultaneously but independently from each other. In addition, for cross-checking MS compliance with their NPs, an exercise with an Excel macro to assess table III.E.3 has been introduced by the Commission for exploring technical improvements for AR evaluation.

As an output of the evaluation of ARs and DT issues, the EWG was requested to produce for every MS:

- a) An evaluation of the AR in a table template provided by the Commission, which already included the pre-screening comments;
- b) An evaluation of the DT issues, commented by MS and pre-screeners, including an STECF judgement on whether the MS comments are acceptable.

The evaluation process at the EWG was set up to focus on topics where the pre-screeners have raised a problem or where the pre-screeners' final assessment of a particular point has revealed to be contentious. With regard to the AR evaluation, the working procedures were set up in way that allows the EWG to focus on further analysing the quality of the AR outcome.

#### **STECF observations**

STECF notes that the AR and DT pre-screening, as in previous years, has proven to be an important and very helpful preparation for the evaluation process. Moreover, due to the higher effort spent in the

pre-screening process, the EWG found that the consistency and coherence across pre-screeners had improved and more time could be spent on the important issues.

STECF acknowledges that the EWG was able to thoroughly address their Terms of Reference with regard to AR and DT evaluation and analysis, resulting in complete detailed lists of follow-up action to be requested from MS. Moreover, the EWG was able to identify recurring issues arising in several Member States, relating to data collection or transmission, to be addressed in future.

STECF observes that overall, the level of MS compliance with the DCF and with reporting requirements in the 2014 ARs shows an improvement compared to previous years, in terms of both MS achievements and the reporting quality.

Concerning the AR evaluation process, however, several suggestions have been put forward by the EWG in order to achieve effective and consistent working procedures. Apart from inconsistencies in the AR submission guidelines and evaluation sheets, to be dealt with in the short term, the EWG again (cf. EWG 14-07 and 14-17) identified the need for a database and online reporting tool for effective and efficient compilation and monitoring of ARs.

STECF notes that the exercise on compilation of AR standard tables by using the Fleet Economic data call, endorsed by STECF PLEN 14-03, has proven to be very useful and going in the right direction in terms of automated processes for AR compilation. The automated compilation of AR tables from existing data, however, has only been limited to the fleet economic tables (AR module III.B) so far. STECF considers that this process should be further expanded to other parts of the AR, such as the tables containing information on fishing activities and sampling intensity (modules III.C and III.E), as well as data for aquaculture and processing industry (modules IV.A and IV.B).

With regard to the evaluation of DT issues, STECF acknowledges the EWG's extensive work on a total of over 800 issues. STECF notes, however, that the way how end-users report data issues and the prioritisation in the DT assessment still need to be fine-tuned by the Commission. Many of the DT issues reported by the end-users were either redundant, of minor importance or not clearly formulated, which caused unnecessary work by MS on responding to these issues and by STECF evaluating the issues.

STECF found the JRC online platform on DT issues very helpful in the evaluation process. Minor adjustments suggested by the EWG (section 7.1.2) would further improve the handling of DT issues.

## **STECF conclusions**

For both the AR and DT evaluation, STECF concludes that the expanded pre-screening process applied before the EWG 15-10 (section 3 of the EWG report) should be kept for future evaluation of DCF compliance, allowing the EWG to focus more on the quality of the outcomes of the AR.

The analysis of the AR and DT has shown that there were several recurring issues arising in several Member States, relating to data collection or transmission highlighted by the EWG (section 6.2). STECF suggests that the Commission takes the proposals of the EWG relating to such issues into account when revising procedures and formats for the reporting and evaluation of ARs and DT. In the case of methodological issues such as sampling strategies, however, these should be addressed to the responsible fora such as RCMs and PGECON.

### Annual reports

STECF concludes that the AR guidelines and evaluation template need additional work in order that they be fully aligned. This work must be carried out in advance of next year's assessment, taking into account the EWG recommendations (section 7) together with comments from the pre-screeners team (Annex 6).

The production of AR standard tables based on data obtained from the Fleet Economic data call was found to be useful. STECF thus concludes that this procedure should be kept and if possible be expanded to other parts of the AR (metier-based, biological and transversal data). This approach could be further elaborated at the EWG 15-15, taking the EWG suggestions for improving the reporting format (section 7.1.3) into account.

As in previous advice (STECF PLEN 14-02 and 14-03), STECF concludes that a database to support the preparation, management and assessment of the AR is the optimum solution to ensure efficiency and transparency in the overall DCF compliance check process. STECF urges the Commission to investigate ways to establish database procedures and online reporting tools in order to achieve these objectives.

#### Data transmission

STECF concludes that the online platform for DT issues should continue to be used and improved by the EWG suggestions (section 7.1.2).

Considering the various problems with the evaluation of DT issues identified by the EWG, STECF urges the Commission to review and amend the formats and procedures used for the end-user feedback on DT in dialogue with the end-users, taking the suggestions compiled by the EWG (section 6.1 and Annex 6) into account.

## REPORT TO THE STECF

### EXPERT WORKING GROUP ON Evaluation of 2014 MS DCF Annual Reports & Data Transmission (EWG-15-10)

Gdynia, Poland, 22-26 June 2015



This report does not necessarily reflect the view of the STECF and the European Commission and in no way anticipates the Commission's future policy in this area



## 1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The STECF Expert Working Group (EWG 15-10) met in Gdynia, Poland, from the 22nd to the 26th of June to assess Annual Reports (AR) of the 23 non landlocked Member States. Under the process of evaluation and approval of the outcomes of the National Programmes (NP), the European Commission is legally bound to consult STECF about the execution of the NP approved by the Commission and about the quality of the data collected by the Member States (MS) in accordance with Articles 7.1 and 7.2 of Council Regulation (EC) No 199/2008. The task of assessing the Member States AR constitutes the Term of Reference 1 (ToR1) of this EWG.

In addition, annually the Commission needs to evaluate the level of compliance of the DCF Data Transmission (DT) by the Member States to the end users and its ability to meet the criteria set up by the end users. The EWG was requested to assess the feedback from nine end users on 2014 data transmission. Those end users are: ICES, GFCM, ICCAT, JRC, DG MARE, IOTC, IATTC, WCFCP and the Regional Coordination Meetings (RCM). The total number of data transmission issues the group had to assess was 813, unevenly divided over the 23 MS. This task constitutes the ToR2 for this EWG. Annual reports and Data Transmission reports were assessed by a group of pre-screeners before the EWG meeting.

As in previous years, the pre-screening exercise took place beforehand and has proved to be an extremely important step to facilitate the EWG evaluation. Furthermore this year, due to the change on the organization of the pre-screening exercise the outcome was found to have been enhanced on regard to the consistency and coherence across pre-screeners. The outcome of the pre-screening was presented to the group at the beginning of the meeting; a summary of the exercise is included in this report under section 3 and the comments from the exercise are included in annex, Annex 1. The results of the pre-screening were made available to the STECF EWG experts by the 19th of June.

During the EWG, the assessment of the AR and DT issues were carried out in subgroups. The 28 experts attending the meeting were split into four subgroups and tasked with different modules from the annual report and subsets of the DT issues, in accordance with the expertise in the subgroup. The expertise was split into two subgroups of biologists, one subgroup of economists and a subgroup of economists and biologists.

To thoroughly comply with ToR 1 and ToR2, the EWG was requested to produce two types of outputs, one template (excel file) for each Member State (MS) with the evaluation of their Annual Report and an evaluation of the data transmission to end users, via the new online platform for exchanges on data transmission. The EWG was able to thoroughly address ToR 1 and ToR2 and according to the request, the outputs were produced for each MS. Those are included in the report under Annexes 3 and 4, and organized by MS in alphabetical order. Also as requested as feedback from the EWG, it has been identified the comments that require a reaction by the MS and those that are for information only.

The conclusions from ToR 1 - Evaluation of the Annual reports, are:

- The annual reports from 23 MS were duly evaluated; overall, the level of achievement of the 2014 Annual Reports shows an improvement compared with previous years; it shows a significant improvement in quality for both the achievements attained by MS and their reporting procedures.
- Six MS scored with an overall evaluation of Yes (compliance level >90%), fourteen MS with an overall evaluation of Mostly (50 %< compliance level<90%), and three with Partial (10%<compliance level <50%).
- However two MS have been downgraded on the evaluation of their outcomes when compared with last year's evaluation. These MS are Belgium, and France.

- Evaluation templates were produced for each MS and are incorporated in the report under Annex 3 .

The conclusions from ToR 2 – evaluation of Data Transmission Issues are:

- 813 data transmission issues were evaluated;
- From these, 600 issues were judged as satisfactorily justified by MS, 82 unsatisfactorily explained or justified, and there were 129 issues, that due to their nature, were not possible to judge and therefore were identified as unknown (Not possible to Assess).
- The output of this evaluation has been integrated afterwards integrated in the new online platform for exchanges on data transmission; however during the EWG the work was carried out in excel files since the platform is not yet developed on the level needed to support the work and the needs of the EWG.

Even though the task has been accomplished, the group concluded that the exercise on the assessment of the data transmission compliance still needs to be fine-tuned by the Commission; this was already a conclusion from last year's assessment. The EWG would like to urge the Commission for the importance of the revision of the exercise before next year's assessment. Moreover, there are several issues for which its clarification is paramount for the good development of the work. The EWG urges these issued to be clarified and/or solved before next year's evaluation. These issues are identified under Section 5.

Apart from the exercise on the assessment of the AR and on the data transmission compliance, the group was also tasked with a ToR3 and a ToR4.

In specific Tor 3 aimed at collecting the EWG feedback on regard to three main points: suggestions to improve the way in end-users provide feedback to the commission in the future; identify recurring issues arising in several Member States and identify Member State-specific issues relating to data collection or transmission. The feedback on regard to these three points was prepared and is presented in sections 6.1 to section 6.3 of the report. Important suggestions/comments were putted forward by the EWG. Fundamental questions are:

- The importance of getting an objectively described issue from the end-user. The lack of clarity undermines the work of the group because not only is impossible to be assessed but also may jeopardize issues of main relevance.
- Several issues are recurrent in MS Annual reports. Issues such as moving toward the implementation of Statistical Sound Sampling Survey (4S) and the problems in assessing this implementation; the provision of data collected before MS accession and/or DCF implementation, the discrepancies between DCF provisions and the RFMO requirements, amongst others.
- For each MS an independent feedback on specific-issues in the AR and DT was prepared and is presented in annex 5.

Lastly, ToR4 aimed at collecting a set of comments and suggestions and identify actions that could improve this exercise in the future. Important conclusions and recommendation from the group were drawn:

- The guidelines and the evaluation template still need some additional work in order to be fully aligned, this work must be carried out in advance of next year's assessment and the observations from this EWG together with comments from the pre-screeners team (annex 6) must be used as input;
- The online platform for exchanges on data transmission was found to be of major relevance and usefulness, however some adjustments are still need in order to make this tool of good use by this EWG;

- The pilot project on the production of the AR standard tables was found useful and must be kept. On the extend of the possibilities it should be enlarged to other variables (biological and transversal). This exercise can be further ellaborated under forthcoming EWGs.
- A database to support the preparation, management and assessment of the AR is the optimum solution to ensure efficiency and transparency on this process. Other solutions will always be suboptimal compared to the one that has been identified and requested for several years now.

## 2 INTRODUCTION

The STECF Expert Working Group (EWG 15-10) met in Gdynia, Poland, from the 22nd to the 26th of June 2015 to assess Annual Reports (AR) of the 23 non landlocked Member States. Under the process of evaluation and approval of the outcomes of the National Programmes (NP), the European Commission is legally bound to consult STECF about the execution of the NP approved by the Commission and about the quality of the data collected by the Member States (MS) in accordance Articles 7.1 and 7.2 of Council Regulation (EC) No 199/2008.

The work was developed by 28 independent experts; the list of participants is included in section 6. The agenda is included in Annex 1. The assessment of Annual Reports (AR) and Data Transmission Compliance (DT) was split by subgroups and experts were allocated to each sub-group according to the expertise. Prior to the EWG assessment, the AR and DT issues were evaluated by a pre-screening group that worked on an ad-hoc contract basis to DG MARE. Eleven experts pre-screened the MS annual reports and the data compliance feedback from the end users.

### 2.1 Terms of Reference for EWG-15-10

Note that for items 1 and 2 below, a pre-screening exercise will take place to facilitate the work of the EWG.

1. Evaluate Member States Annual Reports for 2014 in accordance with Article 7.2 of Council Regulation (EC) No 199/2008, taking into account;

- a. The execution of the National Programs for 2014
- b. The quality of the data collected by the Member States

2. Evaluate Member States transmission of DCF data to end users in 2014 based on information from end users and Member States' clarifications & explanations in response to the end-user feedback. Particular attention will be paid to:

Response by MS to calls for data launched by the Commission in order to feed into scientific advice provided by STECF:

- Aquaculture data call,
- Annual Effort data call,
- Fleet economic data call,
- Processing industry data call,
- Mediterranean & Black Sea data call,
- As well as the Sea bass data call launched by DG MARE.

b. Data transmission to other end-users in 2014 with a focus on feedback on data availability, quality, gaps and the data used in the scientific advisory process provided by RCMs, ICES, GFCM, IATTC, ICCAT, IOTC, WCPFC and other RFMO to which scientific fishery data is mandatorily submitted by MS;

The EWG should produce for every Member State a) an evaluation of the annual report in the (excel) template provided by the Commission which already included the result of the pre-screening exercise; b) an evaluation of the data transmission to end users, via the new online platform for exchanges on data transmission. In their feedback, the EWG should identify the comments that require a reaction by the MS (resubmission of the annual report or clarification to the Commission) and those that are 'for information' only. The EWG evaluation should be developed as a second level assessment, focusing on

topics where the pre-screeners have raised a problem/or where the pre-screeners final assessment of a particular point has revealed to be contentious; and additionally to this the EWG should focus on further analysing the quality of the AR outcomes.

3. Carry out an analysis of the Annual Report and data transmission exercises in view of identifying:
  - Feedback to be provided to end-users in order to improve the way in which they provide data transmission feedback to the Commission in future.
  - identify recurring issues arising in several Member States, relating to data collection or transmission, which should be addressed to ensure that end users receive the data they need and make suggestions for addressing these in future (e.g. amending the EU MAP, developing joint/agreed methodologies, changes to data calls...)
  - Identify Member State-specific issues relating to data collection or transmission, which should be addressed to ensure that end users receive the data they need (e.g. amending National Programmes, re-evaluating derogations)
4. Comment on how the new Annual Report & STECF evaluation templates, the data transmission IT platform, derogations lists, and other tools provided by the Commission have facilitated (or not) the evaluation exercise by STECF. Comment on the pilot project that took place in the context of the 2015 data call for fleet economic data, to reuse data from the data call to produce tables for the 2014 Annual Report. Make recommendations on how the process can further be improved in future.

## **2.2 Structure of the report**

A description of the pre-screening exercise held beforehand is included in the report and shortly presented in section 3. Section 4 to 7 presents the results produced by the EWG1510. For each assessment, AR and DT, a description is given on how the work has been organised “Setting the scene” and also an overview of the results. These are presented in sections 4 and section 5 of this report. The outputs of the evaluation for each MS are included as annexes (annexes 3 and 4).

Outputs for Tor3 and ToR 4 are presented in sections 6 and 7 of this report, respectively.

## **3 PRE-SCREENING EXERCISE**

Prior to the EWG assessment, the AR and DT issues have been evaluated by a pre-screening group that worked on an ad-hoc contract basis to DG MARE. Eleven experts pre-screened the MS annual reports and the data compliance feedback from the end users. The task allocation among the eleven experts was split by module as follows:

- 2 fleet economists, dealing with modules III.B and III.F; 11-12 MS each, apart from their own, plus module IV for the MS of the aqua./proc. economist below; Data calls on fleet economics and effort.
- 2 aquaculture/processing industry economist, dealing with modules IV.A and IV.B; all MS apart from his own, Data calls on aquaculture and processing industry
- biologists, dealing with modules I, III.C, III.D, III.E and VI; 7-8 MS each, apart from their own, plus all other general and biological modules for the MS of the biologist below Data calls: ICES, Med&BS, GFCM, ICCAT, IOTC and WCPFC
- 2 biologist, dealing with modules II, III.A, III.G, V, VII, VIII-XI; for all MS apart from his own; no data calls

The group started its work when the data transmission became available, mid-June, and from the 4th of June to the 19th the group has pre-screened the AR on the extent of the availability of the AR. Final results were delivered on 19th of June. Therefore the documents from pre-screeners were available

three days in advance to the meeting to all the experts through the web folder for the EWG meeting at the STECF FTP facilities.

The pre-screeners were tasked with the assessment of the Annual Reports against the Guidelines for Annual Reports (as updated in 2015) to check the following eight criteria established in EWG-11-02:

- the respect of report structure as demanded in the guidelines,
- the completion of the information both in the text and tables,
- the consistency of the information between the tables,
- the integrity of the tables vs the agreed set of NP proposal tables,
- the respect of naming convention,
- the respect of the guidelines as regards the information reported in the columns of the tables,
- the respect of international references,
- the realisation vs the planned figure.

The pre-screeners were also requested to give feedback on the current exercise and how it has worked and also comments on how to improve in the future.

The pre-screening output on the AR and DT were provided in the assessment template and in the IT tool Compliance Platform, respectively. Regarding the feedback on the production of a overview about the four points identified before, this is presented in Annex 6. The same feedback was made available to the group and thus used as input for EWG1510 for the preparation of ToRs 3 and 4, as presented in the sections 6 and 7 of this report.

## 4 TOR 1 - EVALUATION OF MEMBER STATES ANNUAL REPORTS FOR 2014

### 4.1 Setting the scene

#### **Formation of Subgroups and task allocation:**

The assessment of Annual Reports (AR) and Data Transmission Compliance (DT) was split by subgroups and experts were allocated to each sub-group according to the expertise. In each sub-group two experts were identified as group facilitators. Whenever possible this role has been assumed by experts that have participated in the pre-screening exercise. For that, the experts were split in four subgroups according to their expertise as presented in table 1. Each sub-group was tasked with the assessment of part of the AR according with the table below.

**Table 1 – Allocation of Modules by sub-group and expertise.**

Module	Sub-group	Expertise	subroup facilitator
Modules IIIB and IV and VII – XI	Sub-group 1	Economist	Evelina Sabatella and Edvardas Kazlauskas
Modules I, II, IIIA, IIIF, VI	Sub-group 2	Economist and Biologists	Jörg Berkenhagen and Paolo Carpiantieri

Modules IIIC and IIIE	Sub-group 3	Biologists	Henrik Degel and Grainne Ni Chonchuir
Modules IIID, IIIG and V	Sub-group 4	Biologist	Ingeborg de Boois and Christoph Stransky

As adopted during the previous year, the EWG went through all parts of the annual reports, and a complete overview of this assessment is provided in the current report. However, the outcome of the evaluation of the modules VIII to XI is not considered for final overall evaluation attributed to each MS.

### **Background Information**

To carry out the evaluation, the group was provided with access to some supporting information such as the AR evaluation templates from previous years (2012 and 2013) and the list of derogations the Commission has granted to the Member States.

### **Tools and Criteria for the Assessment**

The evaluation template used for the assessment is included under Annex 2. This is an improved version of the evaluation form used in the past. Four main categories are used to judge AR achievements. These four categories are shown in table below and are the same that have been in use in the past.

**Table 2 – Compliance levels for the assessment of Annual Reports.**

<b>Compliance class</b>	<b>Compliance level</b>	<b>Score</b>
No	<10%	<b>N</b>
Partly	10-50%	<b>P</b>
Mostly	50-90%	<b>M</b>
Yes	>90%	<b>Y</b>
NA	not applicable	<b>NA</b>

In order to ensure a comparable and coherent approach across sub-groups a first assessment of one Annual Report was done in plenary. During this joint exercise, the criteria to settle a common ground for the assessment were agreed by the group and then used to support the sub-groups assessment. The rules agreed upon are presented in the box below:

The two columns with comments from the Pre-screener are to be kept. EWG comment must be added in one additional column.

#### **EWG evaluation in 3 columns with all cells fulfilled**

EWG comments: if no comments, insert “No comments”

EWG judgment: “Yes”, “Mostly”, “Partly”, “No”

Action needed: if no action needed, insert “No action needed”

Cells in columns (EWG comment/EWG judgment/ Action needed) cannot be left in blank.

**If pre-screeners have assessed:**

- (Yes, Yes) or (Mostly, Mostly) without any comment -> accept as final.
- (Yes, Yes) or (Mostly, Mostly) but a comment was added->
  - If the comment could result on a different judgement, verify again;
  - If the comment in any way can justify a different judgement. Accept the comment and the judgement.
- Whenever the outcome from both pre-screeners is not concordant: verify again.
- Particular situation must be given to issues that have already been identified in previous years. This must be thoroughly scrutinized and good note must be taken so a proper feedback can be prepared at end reg. ToR3.1.

**Incomplete tables**

**In the identification of the “Action needed”:** MS should be asked to resubmit the AR with a fulfilled set of tables, and when relevant, the text has to be amended accordingly.

**Minor issues (i.e. Variables not applicable, table formats, etc)**

**In the identification of the “Action needed”:** The MS must be requested to correct the situation for next year and onwards.

Additionally to the assessment of the AR through the template, each subgroup had to prepare the answer to six questions that were raised at the beginning of the meeting. These questions aim at collecting an overview and reflexions from each sub-group about the assessment exercise. These inputs were also considered to answer ToR 3 and ToR 4.

The Questions are:

1. Overall comments on the pre-screening exercise. How does the new approach results? Any relevant comment for future improvements?
2. Overall performance of Member States on your Modules. Overview - of the 23 MS, How many were YES, Mostly, Partially, NO?
3. Overall what were the four major issues that arose in your evaluation across MS? How would you resolve these? – Provide recommendations. (to be considered for ToR3)
4. Any specific issues (max 4) that arose that you would like to highlight. How would you resolve these? Provide recommendations? (to be considered for ToR3)
5. What MS would you cite as good examples of how to complete these modules?
6. Comment on how the new Annual Report & STECF evaluation templates, the data transmission IT platform, derogations lists, and other tools provided by the Commission have facilitated (or not) the evaluation exercise by STECF. Please also consider the possible use of macro to do the first verification of the standard tables as shown in the exercise performed by DG MARE. (to be considered for ToR4)



## 4.2 Results

The overall evaluation shown in Table 3 is the summary evaluation of each MS based on the traffic light system and on the scale provided in Table 2. Overall, the level of achievement of the 2014 Annual Reports shows an improvement compared with previous years; it shows a significant improvement in quality for both the achievements attained by MS and their reporting procedures. Similar overview tables on the MS DCF performance can be found at the following STECF reports for years 2010 to 2013 ([STECF12-01](#)<sup>1</sup>; [STECF-OWP-12-05](#)<sup>2</sup>; [STECF13-14](#)<sup>3</sup>; [STECF14-13](#)<sup>4</sup>)

Sections 4.2.1 to 4.2.5 present the replies provided by the subgroups to the six questions. The detailed spreadsheets for each Member State are presented in Annex 3 and organized in alphabetical order. Also the compilation from Section IX –“Comments, suggestions and reflections” provided by the MS in their Annual Reports is presented in this report under annex 7.

---

<sup>1</sup> Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries. Analysis of the DCF Annual Reports for 2010 (STECF-12-01). 2012. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, EUR 25250 EN, JRC 69389, 251 pp.

<sup>2</sup> Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries. Evaluation of MS Annual Reports for 2011 of the DCF (STECF-OWP-12-05). 2012. . Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, EUR 25450 EN, JRC 73248, 239 pp.

<sup>3</sup> Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) – Evaluation of 2012 MS Technical Reports under DCF (1) (STECF-13-07). 2013. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, EUR 26090 EN, JRC 83658, 183 pp.

<sup>4</sup> Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) – Evaluation of 2013 MS DCF Annual Reports & Data Transmission (STECF-14-13) 2014. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, EUR 26811 EN, JRC 91550, 257 pp.

**Table 3 – Summary of the assessment of Member State’ 2014 Annual Report of the Data Collection Framework.**

	BEL	BUL	CYP	DNK	DEU	ESP	EST	FIN	FRA	GBR	GRC	HRV	IRL	ITA	LAT	LTU	MLT	NLD	POL	PRT	ROU	SVN	SWE
OVERALL COMPLIANCE	P	P	M	M	M	Y	M	Y	P	Y	M	Y	M	M	Y	M	M	M	Y	M	M	M	M
Module I	M	Y	M	Y	M	Y	Y	Y	P	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	M
Module II	Y	P	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	Y	M	Y	M	M	Y	Y	M	M	Y	M
Module III.A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Module III.B	M	P	M	M	Y	Y	M	Y	P	M	M	Y	M	M	M	M	Y	P	Y	M	M	Y	M
IIIC	P	P	Y	M	M	Y	P	Y	P	Y	M	M	Y	M	Y	M	M	M	Y	Y	M	P	Y
IIID	P	Y	Y	P	Y	Y	Y	Y	P	Y	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	Y	M	Y	Y	M	P	M	Y
IIIE	P	P	M	Y	M	Y	P	Y	M	Y	Y	Y	M	M	Y	P	P	P	Y	M	Y	P	Y
IIIF	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
IIIG	M	P	P	Y	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	Y	M	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	Y	P	M	Y
Module IV.A	NA	P	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	M	P	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	Y	P	Y	P	Y	Y	M
Module IV.B	Y	P	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	Y	M	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	Y	Y	P	Y	Y	M	M	Y	M
Module V	Y	Y	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	M	Y	M	M	M	Y
Module VI	M	M	Y	M	Y	M	M	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	M	M	M	Y
Module VII	(Not applicable given there were no recommendations to be considered for 2014)																						
Module VIII	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Module IX	Y	NA	NA	N	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	Y	NA	Y	NA		NA	NA	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y
Module X	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	Y
Module XI	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

#### 4.2.1 SUB GROUP 1

**Subgroup participants:** Edvardas Kazlauskas, Evelina Sabatella, Edo Avdič, Irina Davidjuka, Jordi Guillem, Michel Ebelling, Arina Motova, Ivana Vukov.

**Modules dealt with:** IIIB, IV and VII – XI

#### 1. Overall comments on the pre-screening exercise. How does the new approach results? Any relevant comment for future improvements?

- **Pre-screening exercise: evaluation of AR**

The Pre-screening exercise is very helpful and it should be retained.

For the first time this year, two pre-screeners evaluated the same modules and countries. EWG was requested to address in particular the issues where pre-screeners disagree.

The quality and the consistency of evaluations amongst the two pre –screeners were in general good. In some cases, they highlighted different issues and this increased the completeness of the evaluation.

In most cases, pre-screeners reported a judgment in terms of yes/mostly/partly/no followed by a comment. The subgroup considers that pre-screeners should provide a complete list of issues and comments and only after them they could provide a proposal to help in the final evaluation (for instance: minor issue, repetitive issue, etc.).

- **Pre-screening exercise: evaluation of data transmission to end users**

The pre-screener exercise is considered very useful for the evaluation of data transmission failures, because issues are very complex and they often require to consult a lot of background documents (data calls, NP, AR, DCF, derogations, etc.)

EWG was requested to accept or modify the comments and to give a final assessment. The evaluation received from the pre-screeners had to be re-written in several cases. Overall the evaluation process was affected by unclear end-user comments. Generally, the MS answers were quite clear and detailed, but not always in line with end-user comments.

#### 2. Overall performance of Member States on your Modules. Overview - of the 23 MS, How many were YES, Mostly, Partially, NO?

Module	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	SUM
Module III.B	7	13	3	0	23
Module IV.A	14	2	4	0	20 (*)
Module IV.B	15	6	2	0	23
	36	21	9	0	

(\*) Belgium, Lithuania and Latvia only have fresh water aquaculture, currently not in DCF and therefore the assessment is not performed for this MS.

#### 3. Overall what were the four major issues that arose in your evaluation across MS? How would you resolve these? – Provide recommendations.

- **Clustering**  
The reporting of clustered segments in tables III.B.1, III.B.2, III.B.3 is still not homogenous among MS. According to the guidelines, Table III.B.1 and III.B.3 should contain information on segments which are not clustered or, in case of clustering, for clusters. Table III.B.2 should contain information on the clustering scheme.  
However, some countries report unclustered segments in table III.B.1 and III.B.3, even if they are reported as clustered in table III.B.2. This might happen due to misinterpretation of guidelines, or when the data is collected on each individual fleet segment level and clustering is implemented only for data transmission purposes and not for data collection.
- **Supra-regions**  
According to guidelines, if the same methodology is applied in all supra-regions then MS can insert one common text for all supra-regions under a heading that states “All Supra-Regions”.  
However, in some cases only one common text is reported even if methodology is different for part of the variables. This affects the evaluation process.
- **Deviations from NP**  
Deviations from NP are not always provided. Description of new methodologies or new sampling schemes is given without providing explanations and/or justifications of deviations from NP. In these cases, an amendment of NP should be necessary.
- **Capital cost and capital value**  
According to guidelines, a specific section should include a description of methods and assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs. But this section is missing for several ARs.

**4. Any specific issues (max 4) that arose that you would like to highlight. How would you resolve these? Provide recommendations?**

- Sample sizes and response rates appear to be low for several fleet segments. This could affect the quality of final estimates. In addition, MS describe the actions they will take to increase sample size and/or the response rates, but this seems to be a recurrent issue.
- The subgroup recommends PGECON to address this point and to analyse the possibility of suggesting/put forward best practices to define the sample dimension when deemed to be necessary.
- Response rates could be wrongly calculated in case the planned sample number increases over the survey year. In this case, MS should provide information in the AR on the actual sample size for the reference year.
- Regarding evaluation of data transmission, the subgroup considers that the number of issues to be assessed is very high and not homogenous, because some issues are much more relevant than others in terms of coverage/completeness of time series/impact on data analysis. Minor issues should be sent to MS but only major issues should be evaluated and assessed.

**5. What MS would you cite as good examples of how to complete these modules?**

Finland, Germany, Slovenia, Poland be regarded as good examples for Modules III.B, IV.A and IV.B, considering the overall implementation of the AR guidelines

#### 4.2.2 SUB GROUP 2

**Subgroup participants:** Jörg Berkenhagen, Cecile Brigaudeau, Paolo Carpentieri, Christian Dintheer, Jukka Pönni, Ireneusz Wojcik, Armelle Jung.

**Modules dealt with:** Modules I, II, IIIA, IIIF, and VI.

##### 1. Overall comments on the pre-screening exercise. How does the new approach results? Any relevant comment for future improvements?

Generally, the work done by pre-screeners is very useful. The pre-screening is a good fundament for faster and more efficient evaluation during EWG, focussing on issues that have been brought up. SG2 could also verify the functionality of the new approach (two pre-screeners) for Module III.F. Given the wide range of potential issues it is not unlikely that an issue is overlooked by one pre-screener only. It has proven that double pre-screening leads to a more comprehensive result.

##### 2. Overall performance of Member States on your Modules. Overview - of the 23 MS, How many were YES, Mostly, Partially, NO?

Module	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	SUM
I	19	3	1	0	23
II	14	8	1	0	23
III.A	23	0	0	0	23
III.F	21	2	0	0	23
VI	14	9	4	0	23

##### 3. Overall what were the four major issues that arose in your evaluation across MS? How would you resolve these? – Provide recommendations.

- Discrepancies between the guidelines and the evaluation form (e.g. website, participation to the meeting, transversal variables). Example: Module II.B.1. Participation to the meetings, form is not compatible with guidelines. Now the meetings are recommended, there is no obligations to attend the meeting (except for RCM meeting 199/2008 Article 5).  
“Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?” This question cannot be evaluated on the basis of the current Guidelines. It is not required from the guidelines to explain the non – attendance. The evaluators has no the list of meeting that MS planned to attend.  
Table VI.1: there could be some discrepancies between this table and the year to which data refers.  
Example: A MS didn’t carried out any activities in 2014 but MS was able to submit the data of the previous years (Should we consider it as compliance?)  
Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? This question could be tricky!! It is not requested form the guidelines to describe the progress. Not every year MS could update it...
- Data transmission: The issues raised by the end users very often are not clear. Questions raised to MS should be more detailed. Could be useful to take in consideration a sort of common template for end users? Minor issues concerning DT could be evaluated before and deleted from the total huge list of questions.

- Discrepancies between RFMO requests and EU Regulation (e.g. requirements of RFMO that are not under the EU Regulations like tuna data, discards etc.)

**4. Any specific issues (max 4) that arose that you would like to highlight. How would you resolve these? Provide recommendations?**

- **Derogations, International agreements, Data calls**

Following both the structure of the AR and the guidelines, it is very difficult to judge if a MS has listed all the derogations, it has answered to all data calls, or it has listed all the international agreements. Evaluators could accept only those that are listed. In some cases, due to the experience of the evaluator(s) it is possible to recognize missing information, but this in many cases can be considered a coincidence!

A complete List of derogations, List of international agreements, and List of data calls could help both the MS in the compilation of the tables and thereafter the evaluators in their work (e.g. the use of a drop down menu could be useful?).

Concerning the List of agreements, it could be possible to find something at regional level, but it was not always the updates ones. The list of data calls as it is now its not very useful, it could be indicative, but it's not possible to link it with a single MS. It's impossible to know to which country a specific data call is addressed.

- **Transversal variables**

There is only one line for commenting on the table III.F1 ("...consistent with AR guidelines?"). This not optimal for addressing questionable figures in tables (especially when they might not violate AR guidelines).

In contrast, the III.F evaluation template provides 6-12 lines for each capacity, effort and landings, taking up the structure of the AR text (Achievements, Quality, Follow-up, Actions). Usually there is nothing to comment on the vast majority of lines. Most data in this section are derived from sources covered through the Control Regulation (e.g. logbooks). The template might be designed with more emphasis on other data sources (basically surveys) for which these aspects are more relevant.

There is a cell missing for commenting on insufficient information in the text part.

As far as transversal variables are concerned there has never been a specific LM recommendation yet. On the other hand there have been some suggestions for amendments which did not necessarily undergo LM approval, but went directly into AR guidelines, e.g, from EWGs. Narrowing the scope to LM recommendations might not be optimal, at least not for transversal variables. Given the observed irrelevance of LM recommendations thus far the item might be skipped in the transversal section or broadened to all relevant meetings. As an alternative, guidelines might have to be updated whenever new recommendations have been released by any relevant body. Then the guidelines would be sufficient as reference.

The assignment of energy consumption is not clear: It is listed in Appendix VI and might have to go into Table III.B.3, but at the same moment, it is characterized as effort variable, which is expected in Table III.F.1. This should be clarified. Given the fact that fuel consumption is part of the fleet economics data call, it could be included in III.B.3.

The header "Region" in Table III.F.1" is misleading. According to COM decision 93/2010 (Appendix II) "Region" is a defined level of spatial resolution. In the context of transversal variables other levels than

“Region” might be appropriate (e.g. supra-region for the capacity variables). The evaluation template does not provide distinction between regions.

Table I.A.1 should be the only source for derogations being used for the AR evaluation. It is not feasible to scrutinise the text and NP for finding the description and the approval of derogations. Thus it has to be assured by MS that the list is exhaustive. Moreover, it has to be assured that the derogations are really approved.

## 5. What MS would you cite as good examples of how to complete these modules?

Module I - Malta; Module II – DEU; Module III.A – PRT; Module III-F – Poland and Module VI – Italy.

### 4.2.3 SUB GROUP 3

**Subgroup participants:** Angeliki Adamidou, Angeles Armesto, Marina Dias, Grainne Ni Chonchuir, Violin Raykov, Susanne Tärnlund, Henrik Degel

**Modules dealt with:** Modules IIIC and IIIE

## 1. Overall comments on the pre-screening exercise. How does the new approach results? Any relevant comment for future improvements?

Pre-screening with two pre-screeners helped in complicated modules like III.C and III.E and helped focus the discussions on difficult issues, and in doing so saved time during the EWG meeting.

Highlighted cells where pre-screeners did not agree or where serious issues occurred helped to focus screening discussions.

It would be beneficial to keep the new system with 2 pre – screeners.

It is useful to have the possibility to look into to what extent the two pre-viewers are consistent in their judgements. This provides a source assuring the consistency of the pre-view across pre-screeners.

## 2. Overall performance of Member States on your Modules. Overview - of the 23 MS, How many were YES, Mostly, Partially, NO?

Module	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	SUM
III.C (Metier related variables)	9	9	5	-	23
III.E (Biological Stock related variables)	10	6	7	-	23

## 3. Overall what were the four major issues that arose in your evaluation across MS? How would you resolve these? – Provide recommendations.

- One of the major issues identified during the screening of the DCF Annual Reports was the move towards Statistically Sound sampling (4S). This change in sampling strategy to randomised sampling results in achievement levels different to those specified in the original NP proposal, and makes it difficult to answer questions regarding achievement levels compared to planned targets. The approach adopted in this year’s EWG was to accept the results of the statistically sounds sampling strategies, as they were expected, and in general were, quite similar to planned targets. A certain level of under and over sampling was expected, and new metiers were sampled, as new fisheries developed (boarfish fishery).

However in a small number of cases, significant under sampling or a complete lack of sampling of major metiers or sampling frames, cannot be explained away under the umbrella of moving to a Statistically Sound Sampling strategy, and in these cases, the Member States have been asked to provide more detailed explanations for these deviations.

- Some MS's have updated their metier ranking and selection in the Annual Reports for 2014, however this was not updated in the NP, and so it can be very difficult to judge planned and achieved sampling when comparing the AR results to an outdated NP. It would be very useful for NP proposals to be updated with the newly selected metiers and the planned sampling targets.
- For several MS achieved length sampling of catches, landings and discards by metier and species (table III.C.6) does not reflect concurrent sampling achievements (i.e. only G1 and G2 species represented, by-catch species missing) as referred in table III.C.4. Apart from the information included in table III.C.4, it would be very useful if MS could provide clear information about how concurrent sampling at sea and on-shore is being implemented and difficulties met while trying to implement it.

**4. Any specific issues (max 4) that arose that you would like to highlight. How would you resolve these? Provide recommendations?**

- The automated translation of the text of the Spanish Annual Report was quite poor and makes the task of comparing the text with the tables difficult. Spain should endeavour to submit an English translation of the AR text to aid evaluation.
- Non-compliance with the guidelines concerning the name of the "Region" is crucial for the evaluation process. MS in all cases should cross check the correct name is registered in each table.

**5. What MS would you cite as good examples of how to complete these modules**

III.C (Metier related variables): Finland, Spain, Sweden, Poland, Ireland, Latvia and UK

III.E (Biological Stock related variables): Denmark, Finland, Greece, Latvia

Six MS received "Yes" for both Module III.C. and III.E.

*4.2.4 SUB GROUP 4*

**Subgroup participants:** Margaret Bell, Stephen Warnes, Ingeborg De Boois, Tomasz Nermer, Gheorghe Radu, Christoph Stransky, Jens Ulleweit

**Modules dealt with:** Modules IIID, IIIG and V

**1. Overall comments on the pre-screening exercise. How does the new approach results? Any relevant comment for future improvements?**

Pre-screening with two pre-screeners helped in complicated modules like III.D (recreational fisheries) Highlighted cells where pre-screeners did not agree or where serious issues occurred helped to focus screening discussions

**2. Overall performance of Member States on your Modules. Overview - of the 23 MS, How many were YES, Mostly, Partially, NO?**

Module	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	SUM
III.D (recreational fisheries)	16	3	4	0	23



III.G (research surveys at sea)	14	6	3	0	23
V (ecosystem indicators)	17	6	0	0	23

**3. Overall what were the four major issues that arose in your evaluation across MS? How would you resolve these? – Provide recommendations.**

**III.D:**

- Recreational fisheries are not part of NPs, so it is difficult to evaluate achievements
- MSs not following guidelines for text. This was especially problematic for countries having activities in multiple regions
- Insufficiently detailed information in the text making it impossible to judge achievements
- Incorrect reporting on status of derogations; Commission to check if derogations apply, and to respond quickly to derogation requests, either by approving or rejecting derogation, or by providing information on the further procedure.

**III.G:**

- Related to achievements of research surveys at sea: bad weather and technical problems. There is no way to solve those; results sometimes deviate from planned target.
- MED&BS Surveys often hindered by financial issues.

**V:**

- MSs sometimes did not split up different areas.
- Conflicting information between table and text.

**4. Any specific issues (max 4) that arose that you would like to highlight. How would you resolve these? Provide recommendations?**

**- Derogations:**

Commission is asked to check if derogations apply, and to respond quickly to derogation requests, either by approving or rejecting derogation, or by providing information on the further procedure.

In some instances MSs have written requests for derogations in the NP Proposals which have subsequently been accepted by the Commission, but those derogations do not appear in the list of derogations provided to the STECF-EWG 15-10. It appears that these derogations have been obtained by default. It is the Commission's responsibility to ensure that those derogations are incorporated in the overview of derogations by MS.

**- Data calls/Data transmission:**

For many ICES groups (i.a. WGMIXFISH, WGCEPH, WGCSE, WGNSSK, WGDEEP) general comments were sent to MSs on timeliness and quality. In many cases the comments did not apply to the MS concerned, resulting in an excessive and unnecessary burden of responses for the MSs which had to be reviewed by STECF-EWG 15-10. Feedback from WGs on data calls should be specifically addressed to the MSs it applies to.

WGs should be aware that wish lists for data not covered by DCF are not data transmission failures and that requirements of modification of the DCF should be discussed with the Commission and RCMs.

MSs should always fully respond to the question, and not by referring to another line in the report.

The DT table contained some wrong categorisation of the end-user feedback (timeliness reported as quality or v.v.).

## 5. What MS would you cite as good examples of how to complete these modules?

III.D (recreational fisheries): Poland, Spain (except for the language reported in), UK

III.G (surveys at sea): Poland, Spain (except for the language reported in), UK

V (ecosystem indicators): Poland, Spain (except for the language reported in), UK

## 5 TOR 2 - EVALUATE MEMBER STATES TRANSMISSION OF DCF DATA TO END USERS IN 2014

### 5.1 Setting the scene

Under ToR2, the EWG was requested to evaluate the compliance of the data transmission by Member States to the end users over 2014 based on information from end users and Member States' clarifications & explanations in response to the end-user feedback.

There were 813 issues from nine different end-users addressed to the EWG for evaluation. The EWG was requested to evaluate on a scientifically ground if it consider **satisfactory** or **unsatisfactory** the explanation/feedback provided by the MS to the issue raised by the end-users.

**Table 4 – Summary table of the data transmission issues addressed to the STECF EWG1510 for assessment.**

End-user	Data Call	Nr.data Issues
DG MARE	Seabass/Effort	3
GFCM	Task 1.2, 1.3, 1.4 and 1.5	38
IATTC		1
ICCAT	T1FC: Fleet Characteristics, T1NC: Nominal Catches, T2CE: Catch and Effort and T2SW/CAS: Catch-at size	32
ICES	Expert groups: AFWG; HAWG, WGBIE, WGBFAS, WGCEPH, WGCSE, WGDEEP, WGHANSA, WGMIXFISH-ADVICE, WGNEW, WGNSSK, WGWIDE	512
IOTC	Coastal fisheries , Long-line fisheries and size data	3
JRC	Aquaculture, Effort, Fleet economics, Mediterranean and Black Sea and Processing Industry	159
RCM	Baltic, North Atlantic and North Sea and Eastern-arctic	58
WCPFC Total		7
<b>Total</b>		<b>813</b>

The assessment of the data transmission issues was split by the same subgroups as for the AR assessment. The distribution was such that each subgroup assessed the response to the data transmission issues which were related with the Module of the Annual report the group had to assess. This approach was mainly devised to ensure each sub-group would be able to get a broader and comprehensive picture on each MS performance.

### **Background Information:**

As for the AR assessment, for DT assessment the group was provided with some supporting information such as the AR evaluation templates from previous years (2012 and 2013), a copy of the data calls launched in 2014 and the list of derogations the Commission has granted to the Member States.

### **Tools and Criteria for the Assessment**

In order to ensure a comparable and coherent approach across sub-groups the assessment of the Data Transmission issues for one MS were done in plenary. During this joint exercise, the criteria to settle a common ground for the assessment were agreed by the group and then used to support the sub-groups assessment. The rules agreed upon are presented in the table below:

<b>Issue</b>	<b>EWG Assessment</b>
Unclear MS comment	Unknown
End-users do not provide clear comments on data transmission issues (i.e. GFCM). End-user must always provide a self-sufficient comment/feedback to the EWG.	Unknown + a comment: "The end-user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies"
Information between end-users and MS is contradictory.	Unknown
MS mistaken on data transmission	Unsatisfactory
Failure concerning data collection and not data transmission, so data will not be available but situation must be flagged	Unsatisfactory
Data exists but MS fails to submit	Unsatisfactory + a comment: "MS have to take appropriate measures to prepare and provide data in due time"
If MS plan to collect additional data beyond DCF requirements in the NP and don't deliver these data. (this additional collection must be however clearly stated in the NP)	Unsatisfactory

## 5.2 Results

In summary, the evaluation of the transmission issues concluded that 600 issues were satisfactorily justified by the MS, 82 unsatisfactory and for 129 the EWG was not able to make an assessment, therefore these were classified with Unknown.

The complete list of the issues for each MS together with EWG comment and assessment is included in Annex4 containing an individual table for each MS and organized in alphabetic order.

Even though the task was accomplished, the group concluded that the exercise on the assessment on the compliance of the data transmission still needs to be fine-tuned by the Commission. This was also one of the conclusions from the last year's Expert Working Group (STECF EWG 1407) that this EWG would like to reinforce once again.

The points for which the groups draws the Commission attention to, are: (1) repetition of situations already assessed in the past; (2) situation depending on administrative procedures (e.g exchange of correspondence between the COM and MS) which are out of the scope of this EWG or (3) issues that due to its nature are out of the framework of DCF should be filtered in advance by the Commission and not addressed to this EWG for the assessment.

Additionally to the point above the EWG has prepared a list of comments which should support the preparation of next year's data transmission compliance exercise from both the Commission and end-users. These comments are:

- Timeliness should be defined as "the MS delivered the data within the deadline of the data call". It is not sufficient to have data delivered "prior to a WG" as assessments will be run prior to WGs and data are needed to do so. STECF-EWG does then not have to evaluate the data transmission failures related to timeliness as this is then the responsibility of the Commission.
- Regarding evaluation of data transmission, the subgroup considers that the number of issues to be assessed is very high and not homogenous, because some issues are much more relevant than others in terms of coverage/completeness of time series/impact on data analysis. Minor issues should be sent to MS but only major issues should be evaluated and assessed. Large amounts of general irrelevant issues may lead to lack of attention for important and severe issues.
- How could we judge when a MS states "this will not happen again" or "these issues have been resolved"? (This point is valid also for the AR); overview of previous years' comments is needed to evaluate if changes took place. The platform containing all evaluations on data transmission also from previous years will help to keep track of those comments.
- The DT table contained some incorrect categorization of the end-user feedback (timeliness reported as quality or v.v.)
- The group discussed how the severity of data transmission failures could be categorized. That is difficult. For example, if end-users ask for data that will not be used in the assessment or/and in any working groups (e.g. for building up a time-series), the impact of data failure may be lower on the short term, but in the end the data should be there, and an end-user would like to keep track of the data collected.
- Similar discussions arose in relation to timeliness. Should in case data requested are not going to be used by any working groups (e.g. ICCAT requests for data submissions to database) the timeliness considered as a minor data failure? It is not sufficient to put an algorithm on the data transmission failures as severity will always be a matter of expert judgement.

## **6 TOR 3 - ANALYSIS OF THE ANNUAL REPORT AND DATA TRANSMISSION EXERCISES**

### **6.1 Feedback to the end-users about the data transmission feedback to the Commission in future.**

Based on the STECF-EWG 15-10 (Evaluation of Annual reports and Data Transmission) Data Transmission evaluation, the following guidelines for end-users are suggested:

#### *6.1.1 Timeliness*

##### **EWG comment**

End-users should automatically create a date stamp for the response to the data call to prevent discrepancies between submission date by MS and date stamp end-user.

There were several cases where data was identified as not being submitted on time for a data call, yet the MS states that the data was supplied on time and they have the acknowledgement e-mail to support this (e.g. Portugal –id 1452, Denmark –id 1122).

End-users should respect the time-lag for data availability in relation to the deadline of the data call (e.g. Spain –id 1010). If the deadline of a data call is prior to the date on which the data are available, it will never be possible for MSs to respond timely. If the data are really need to be available prior to an end-user's meeting, the end-user may consider postponing the meeting dates.

#### *6.1.2 End-user feedback to MS*

##### **EWG comment**

Addressing MSs - end-users should specifically appoint the MSs the failure applies to in the comment, and send the comment solely to the relevant MSs, to prevent unnecessary burden of responses for other MSs.

In some instances a data failure was identified for a specific MS, and despite the MS being named in the comment it was also included as a data transmission failure for all MS to address. (e.g. Portugal –id 1294, Spain –id 1293, Belgium –id 1296)

#### *6.1.3 Formulation of end-user feedback*

##### **EWG comment**

The data call originator (e.g. end user/working group and/or stock coordinator) should be involved in the creation and evaluation of data transmission, to specify on what data was requested but not provided, the impact this had on the assessment and what action is required. It is the responsibility of the chair of each Working Group or to the end user to ensure that accurate information on data gaps are clearly highlighted in the working group report.

Issues raised by end users very often were not clearly formulated. For example, “questionable data quality for all fleets and gear groups?” or “Coverage of 46%”. To get the proper response from the MS, and evaluate data transmission optimally, it is recommended that end-users formulate questions as specifically as possible, and focused to the issue. End-users should better detail the data missing (e.g. type, quality etc.).

General remarks should not be copied from the end-user data tables when they are addressed to no one in particular and have no real action proposed. Many issues highlighted as “data transmission failures”

and requiring comment from the MSs were idealised scenarios (more discards data required, issues referring several MSs without specifying which ones, etc..) from the assessment working groups, and not data transmission failures.

#### *6.1.4 Data call in relation to data collection and international agreements*

##### **EWG comment**

End-users should be aware that wish lists for data not covered by MSs' data collection under DCF (e.g. requirements of RFMO that are not under the EU Regulations like tuna data and discards, no fisheries in specific areas, species requested on a lower taxonomic level than requested under DCF) are not data transmission failures and that requirements of modification of the DCF should be discussed with the Commission and RCMs.

On the long term, a database containing the derogations and MSs obligations should provide information on the data collected by MS. On the short term it is recommended that end-users add a standard question to any data call: 'Does MS collect data under DCF for this data call?'

End-users should be aware of the workflow and important boards with respect to data collection under the DCF. It was noted that often the feedback between end-user and RCMs is limited. Many discussions, decisions, recommendations done and agreed upon by the different RCMs, and in many cases endorsed by Liaison meeting, are not tackled by some end-users.

#### *6.1.5 Data omissions*

##### **EWG comment**

If a MS has informed the end-user that due to issues beyond their control they are unable to collect certain data, and in spite of this communication the end-user continues to request the data, then only in the first year this can be announced as a data transmission failure, and should not be repeated in following years. Data should not further be requested from the MS for those years.

For example, Greece was not able to carry out any activities due to administrative problems from 2009 to 2012. Consequently, the MS did not collect data, they could not submit data and they will not submit it.

#### *6.1.6 Other topics*

##### **EWG comment**

Repeating year after year non-complying on the same issue by a given MS is annoying. Some kind of procedure should be implemented in order to prevent persistent non-compliance. On the other hand it is encouraging to see if a given MS improves from year to year actually putting an effort in complying with the guidelines.

End-users should consider the contribution of EU MSs to stock information. E.g. for the Arctic and Long distance fisheries EU MSs do only have a low percentage of the information and will not be able to answer to a regional (at stock level) question.

## **6.2 Recurring issues arising in several Member States, relating to data collection or transmission.**

### **6.2.1 Member States:**

**Feedback on National Correspondent Meeting:** Although is written in Commission Regulation 665/2008 (article 3), only few countries provided minutes or summary about the outcomes of National coordination meeting/s.

**EWG comment:** For the future MS should provide minutes of this kind of meeting/s if any, this request must be clearly included in the future guidelines for the Annual Report thus making this guiding document aligned with the DCF legislation.

**Moving towards the Statistically Sound (4S):** The move towards Statistically Sound (4S), or Probability based sampling schemes is a positive move. However in this transition period, it has become difficult and counterproductive to attempt to evaluate planned versus achieved metier based sampling for those Member States who have already adopted statistically sound sampling schemes. The principle of such sampling schemes is that they are designed in such a way that the quality of the resulting sampling has to be considered fit for purpose in terms of coverage etc..

**EWG comment:** The heading “Data Quality” in the Annual Report should be renamed “Data Quality Issues”. And within this section, each MS should provide details of the sampling scheme. Having the details of the sampling scheme will provide information on the accuracy of the data and will allow for a more credible evaluation of the “Quality” of the data in Modules III.C and III.E. However it does also seem to be counterproductive to invest a lot of time into optimising the current DCF AR tables and guidelines for the sake of two years evaluation of the DCF AR.

**Provision of data collected prior to MS accession and/or to DCF implementation:** Although is not mandatory to provide the data collected before DCF entered in force, scientifically having the best data series available is desirable in order to provide the best assessment and advice.

**EWG comment:** all countries should be invited to submit the entire available series of data to the assessment groups. This is particularly relevant for MEDITS data from Italy and Croatia for the GFCM GSA 17.

**Discrepancies between RFMO requests and EU Regulation** (e.g. requirements of RFMO that are not under the EU Regulations like tuna data, discards etc.).

**EWG recommends:** This is an issue that deserves further attention and which the Commission must clarify as soon as possible. Also, this is an issue that shall be properly tackled in the future EU MAP.

**Lack of evidence of the implementation of concurrent sampling by the MS** as it is foreseen in the COM Dec. 93/2010. From the evaluation of the achieved length sampling of catches, landings and discards by metier and species, it appears that concurrent sampling is carried out differently in different Member States and this may lead to inconsistent estimates of overall catch compositions. This is an issue recurrent from previous years and that is common to several MS. In some extent the lacking of this approach may be the reason for lacking of biological data for species other than target species as identified by some end-user about the data transmission issues.

**EWG recommends:** For next year AR and onwards, Member States could include information on how concurrent sampling on-shore and at sea is being applied under the rephrased section “Data

Quality Issues”, as suggested above.” This is a proposal that must be considered when revising the guidelines for the AR2105.

#### **Addition recurrent issues are:**

When replying to Data Transmission issues, MSs should always fully respond to the question, and not by referring to another line in the report (e.g. France –id 1376, and UK –id 135).

Some MSs (e.g. France –id 1039) tend to submit data late resulting in problems at the assessments.

Some MSs (e.g. Spain –id 122) do for political reasons not want to supply data to public databases (e.g. regional databases).

Some MSs (e.g. Belgium –id 2) keep on saying that a database is being developed, and that things will be better next year.

In case of significant data collection reduction (e.g. otoliths) within the running time of the NP proposal MSs should inform RCM for approval.

##### *6.2.2 Actions for the Commission:*

Some MSs (e.g. UK) claim that in NP proposal it is stated that data are not being sampled but there is no formal acceptance of the derogation (relates to STECF-EWG 15-10 comments on derogations). Commission to clarify

Some MSs state that they are not obliged to upload data to international database (e.g. id 122, id 40 in the Data Transmission overview). Commission to clarify the data policy on this regard. Take into account in new data collection.

#### **6.3 Member State-specific issues relating to data collection or transmission which should be addressed to ensure that end users receive the data they need**

The results for this Term of reference are presented in Annex 5. For each MS it was prepared a summary of the assessment of the Annual Report and data Transmission compliance issues. Whenever possible the specific issues that can be identified as recurrent for a particular MS were identified. Anyhow the text produced for each MS may have different levels of detail depending on the expert judgment that have produced the text. Regardless the level of detail, every summary was reviewed in plenary and the conformity of the content with the AR assessment and DT assessment was agreed by the EWG.

## **7 TOR4**

### **7.1 New Annual Report & STECF Evaluation Templates**

#### *7.1.1 Evaluation templates:*

##### **EWG recommendations for the future:**

As mentioned by STECF-EWG 14-07 and STECF-EWG 13-07 this EWG considers it would help to have last year’s judgement in the evaluation template.



Scroll-down lists are helpful in some places, but in the current version, the scroll-down lists appear also on locations where they are not appropriate. This limits the possibility to add useful comments in the STECF EWG comments column.

Drop down function in the comments column should be removed from template as it creates a limitation for proper evaluation.

There are still several unconformities between the guidelines for the AR and Template. Several questions in the template must be revised; this is the case in particular of the question related to the DCF website, participation to the meeting, transversal variables. Detailed information is provided in annex 6, comments/feedback from pre-screeners.

#### *7.1.2 The Data Transmission It Platform, Derogations Lists, And Other Tools Provided By The Commission*

##### **The Data Transmission It Platform**

The new tool implemented by JRC was very efficient and easy to use. The tool allows end-users to fill the data failures in the platform, standardising the presentation of data failures by all the end-users and guarantees to have a complete description of the problems in data transmission. MSs can add their responses in the same platform.

However, it has been only used by the pre-screeners and not by the subgroup. For the tool to be of use by the group in the future some enhancements are still needed.

##### **EWG recommendations for the future:**

The IT tool must allow the selection of issues “filters” based in every of the column with relevant information, and not only select issues based on “DG Mare Decision”, “Country”, “Year”, “Issue Type” and “Severity”. Also to ensure a proper comparison of the issues, the comments and assessments, the user interface must allow the visualisation of several lines at the same time. The look and feel of the interface should be similar to a spreadsheet.

##### **Derogation List:**

The provision of a derogation list has been considered to be of great usefulness for the assessment process, however there are still several unclear issues on regard to the derogations in place, these are

If a MS has specified that in the NP, for example, there is no rec fishery for cod or stock related variables will be collected only through surveys and the NP has been approved, this means that automatically is there a derogation to collect this information?

##### **EWG recommendations for the future:**

The commission must endeavour to clarify the issues about the provision of derogations with the MS.

Additionally to the list of derogation, also a list of international agreements and the list of the metiers per region would be of most importance to support the preparation of the Annual Reports by the MS and then the assessment exercise by the STECF.

#### *7.1.3 Pilot project to produce AR Standard Tables for the 2014 Annual Report:*

Some MS reported in the AR the tables produced by JRC on the basis of the fleet economic data call. This is a good approach and should be further implemented.

### **EWG recommendations for the future:**

The viability of extend this exercise to biological and transversal should be assessed in forthcoming STECF EWG. Now that the Regional databases to manage and store biological data are being devised should be the momentum to also plan and assess how these tools can be used to support the preparation of the AR.

Regarding the exercise carried out this year with economic data, several issues to be considered in the future:

- Table III.B.2 requires fleet at the 1st of January, while data call requires for “target fleet” that could be different,
- Response rates reported in table III.B.1 should be in some way consistent with response rates reported in table III.B.3,
- Naming of fleet segments and formats of the JRC tables differ from guidelines.

#### *7.1.4 Macro Exercise:*

With the purpose of speed up the process of assessment of AR the Commission has proposed the EWG to give some feedback for the possible use of macros for the automatic processing of certain data—especially for the pre-screening exercise. For that, the commission has provided the group with the results of the usage of macros to assess one table in the AR as an exploratory phase to assess the viability of this approach.

### **EWG recommendations for the future:**

Overall, the EWG finds that in a process of standardization, the use of macro is a good approach for the automatisisation of some tasks, however for the assessment of AR standard tables, the use of the macro to automatically check data is suboptimal compared to the optimal solution: a database. The subgroup recommends that time and effort is put in the database instead of in the further development of the macro.

Furthermore, inconsistency between tables both within a given report and between reports (NP, AR) is the major source for obstructions for an efficient evaluation of the AR. This suggests the introduction of a common database for administration of the DCF and concomitantly abandoning the spreadsheet solutions.

Several recommendations have been endorsed in the past by STECF about the need of a database the support the NP and AR preparation.

## 8 CONTACT DETAILS OF STECF MEMBERS AND EWG-15-10 LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

1 - Information on STECF members and invited experts' affiliations is displayed for information only. In some instances the details given below for STECF members may differ from that provided in Commission COMMISSION DECISION of 27 October 2010 on the appointment of members of the STECF (2010/C 292/04) as some members' employment details may have changed or have been subject to organisational changes in their main place of employment. In any case, as outlined in Article 13 of the Commission Decision (2005/629/EU and 2010/74/EU) on STECF, Members of the STECF, invited experts, and JRC experts shall act independently of Member States or stakeholders. In the context of the STECF work, the committee members and other experts do not represent the institutions/bodies they are affiliated to in their daily jobs. STECF members and invited experts make declarations of commitment (yearly for STECF members) to act independently in the public interest of the European Union. STECF members and experts also declare at each meeting of the STECF and of its Expert Working Groups any specific interest which might be considered prejudicial to their independence in relation to specific items on the agenda. These declarations are displayed on the public meeting's website if experts explicitly authorized the JRC to do so in accordance with EU legislation on the protection of personnel data. For more information: <http://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/adm-declarations>

STECF members:

Name	Address <sup>1</sup>	Tel.	Email
<b>STECF members</b>			
Abella, J. Alvaro (vice-chair)	ARPAT – AREA MARE Agenzia Regionale per la Protezione Ambientale della Toscana Articolazione Funzionale RIBM Risorse Ittiche e Biodiversità Marina Via Marradi 114, 57126 Livorno – Italia	Tel. 0039-0555- 3206956	<a href="mailto:alvarojuan.abella@arpat.toscana.it">alvarojuan.abella@arpat.toscana.it</a>
Andersen, Jesper Levring (vice- chair)	Department of Food and Resource Economics (IFRO) Section for Environment and Natural Resources University of Copenhagen Rolighedsvej 25 1958 Frederiksberg Denmark	Tel.dir.: +45 35 28 68 92	<a href="mailto:jla@ifro.ku.dk">jla@ifro.ku.dk</a>
Bailey, Nicholas	Fisheries Research Services Marine Laboratory, P.O Box 101 375 Victoria Road, Torry Aberdeen AB11 9DB UK	Tel: +44 (0)1224 876544 Direct: +44 (0)1224 295398 Fax: +44 (0)1224 295511	<a href="mailto:baileyn@marlab.ac.uk">baileyn@marlab.ac.uk</a> <a href="mailto:n.bailey@marlab.ac.uk">n.bailey@marlab.ac.uk</a>
Bertignac, Michel	Laboratoire de Biologie Halieutique IFREMER Centre de Brest BP 70 - 29280 Plouzane, France	tel : +33 (0)2 98 22 45 25 - fax : +33 (0)2 98 22 46 53	<a href="mailto:michel.bertignac@ifremer.fr">michel.bertignac@ifremer.fr</a>
Cardinale, Massimiliano	Föreningsgatan 45, 330 Lysekil, Sweden	Tel: +46 523 18750	<a href="mailto:massimiliano.cardinale@slu.se">massimiliano.cardinale@slu.se</a>

Name	Address <sup>1</sup>	Tel.	Email
<b>STECF members</b>			
Curtis, Hazel	Sea Fish Industry Authority 18 Logie Mill Logie Green Road Edinburgh EH7 4HS	Tel: +44 (0)131 558 3331 Fax: +44 (0)131 558 1442	<a href="mailto:H_Curtis@seafish.co.uk">H_Curtis@seafish.co.uk</a>
Delaney, Alyne	Innovative Fisheries Management, -an Aalborg University Research Centre, Postboks 104, 9850 Hirtshals, Denmark	Tel.: +45 9940 3694	<a href="mailto:ad@ifm.aau.dk">ad@ifm.aau.dk</a>
Daskalov, Georgi	Laboratory of Marine Ecology, Institute of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Research, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences	Tel.: +359 52 646892	<a href="mailto:gmdaskalov@yahoo.co.uk">gmdaskalov@yahoo.co.uk</a>
Döring, Ralf	Thünen Bundesforschungsinstitut, für Ländliche Räume, Wald und Fischerei, Institut für Seefischerei - AG Fischereiökonomie, Palmaille 9, D-22767 Hamburg, Germany	Tel.: 040 38905-185  Fax.: 040 38905-263	<a href="mailto:ralf.doering@ti.bund.de">ralf.doering@ti.bund.de</a>
Gascuel, Didier	AGROCAMPUS OUEST 65 Route de Saint Briec, bat.4 CS 84215, F-35042 RENNES Cedex France	Tel:+33(0)2.23.48.55.3 4 Fax: +33(0)2.23.48.55.35	<a href="mailto:Didier.Gascuel@agrocampus-ouest.fr">Didier.Gascuel@agrocampus-ouest.fr</a>
Graham, Norman (chair)	Marine Institute, Fisheries Science Services (FSS), Rinville, Oranmore, Co. Galway, Ireland	Tel: + 353(0) 91 87200	<a href="mailto:norman.graham@marine.ie">norman.graham@marine.ie</a>
Garcia Rodriguez, Mariano	Instituto Español de Oceanografía, Servicios Centrales, Corazón de María 8, 28002, Madrid, Spain		<a href="mailto:Mariano.Garcia@md.ieo.es">Mariano.Garcia@md.ieo.es</a>
Gustavsson, Tore Karl-Erik	Independent Consultant, Göteborg, Sweden		<a href="mailto:tore.gustavsson@hotmail.com">tore.gustavsson@hotmail.com</a>
Jennings, Simon	CEFAS Lowestoft Laboratory, Pakefield Road, Lowestoft Suffolk, UK NR33 0HT	Tel.: +44 1502562244 Fax: +44 1502513865	<a href="mailto:simon.jennings@cefass.co.uk">simon.jennings@cefass.co.uk</a>
Kenny, Andrew	CEFAS Lowestoft Laboratory, Pakefield Road, Lowestoft Suffolk, UK NR33 0HT	Tel.: +44 1502562244 Fax: +44 1502513865	<a href="mailto:andrew.kenny@cefass.co.uk">andrew.kenny@cefass.co.uk</a>
Kraak, Sarah	Thünen-Institut für Ostseefischerei, Alter Hafen Süd 2, 18069 Rostock Germany	Tel. +49 3818116113	<a href="mailto:sarah.kraak@ti.bund.de">sarah.kraak@ti.bund.de</a>
Kuikka, Sakari	University of Helsinki, Department of Environmental Sciences, P.O. Box 65 (Viikinkaari 1), FI-00014 University of Helsinki, FINLAND	Tel.: +358 50 3309233 Fax. +358-9-191 58754	<a href="mailto:skuikka@mappi.helsinki.fi">skuikka@mappi.helsinki.fi</a>

Name	Address <sup>1</sup>	Tel.	Email
<b>STECF members</b>			
Martin, Paloma	CSIC Instituto de Ciencias del Mar Passeig Marítim, 37-49 08003 Barcelona Spain	Tel: 34.93.2309500 direct line : 34.93.2309552 Fax: 34.93.2309555	<a href="mailto:paloma@icm.csic.es">paloma@icm.csic.es</a>
Malvarosa, Loretta	NISEA S.c.a.r.l.		<a href="mailto:malvarosa@nisea.eu">malvarosa@nisea.eu</a>
Murua, Hilario	AZTI - Tecnalia / Unidad de Investigación Marina, Herrera kaia portualdea z/g 20110 Pasaia (Gipuzkoa), Spain	Tel: 0034 667174433 Fax: 94 6572555	<a href="mailto:hmurua@azti.es">hmurua@azti.es</a>
Nord, Jenny	The Swedish Agency of Marine and Water Management (SwAM)	Tel. 0046 76 140 140 3	<a href="mailto:Jenny.nord@havochvatten.se">Jenny.nord@havochvatten.se</a>
Nowakowski, Piotr	Maritime University of Szczecin. – Faculty of Food Science and Fisheries, Department of Fishing Technique, Szczecin		<a href="mailto:npfgd@poczta.onet.pl">npfgd@poczta.onet.pl</a>
Prelezzo, Raul	AZTI - Tecnalia / Unidad de Investigación Marina Txatxarramendi Ugarte a z/g 48395 Sukarrieta (Bizkaia), Spain	Tel: 94 6029400 Ext: 406- Fax: 94 6870006	<a href="mailto:rprelezzo@suk.azti.es">rprelezzo@suk.azti.es</a>
Sala, Antonello	Fishing Technology Unit National Research Council (CNR) Institute of Marine Sciences (ISMAR) - Fisheries Section Largo Fiera della Pesca, 1 60125 Ancona - Italy	Tel: +39 071 2078841 Fax: +39 071 55313	<a href="mailto:a.sala@ismar.cnr.it">a.sala@ismar.cnr.it</a>
Scarcella, Giuseppe	Environmental Management Unit National Research Council (CNR) Institute of Marine Sciences (ISMAR) - Fisheries Section Largo Fiera della Pesca, 1 60125 Ancona - Italy	Tel: +39 071 2078846 Fax: +39 071 55313	<a href="mailto:g.scarcella@ismar.cnr.it">g.scarcella@ismar.cnr.it</a>
Somarakis, Stylianios	Department of Biology University of Crete Vassilika Vouton P.O. Box 2208 71409 Heraklion Crete Greece	Tel.: +30 2610 394065, +30 6936566764	<a href="mailto:somarak@biology.uoc.gr">somarak@biology.uoc.gr</a>
Stransky, Christoph	Thünen Institute [TI-SF] Federal Research Institute for Rural Areas, Forestry and Fisheries, Institute of Sea Fisheries, Palmaille 9, D-22767 Hamburg, Germany	Tel. +49 40 38905-228 Fax: +49 40 38905-263	<a href="mailto:christoph.stransky@ti.bund.de">christoph.stransky@ti.bund.de</a>
Theret, Francois	Scapêche 17 Bd Abbé Le Cam 56100 Lorient France		<a href="mailto:ftheret@comata.com">ftheret@comata.com</a>
Ulrich, Clara	DTU Aqua, National Institute of Aquatic Resources, Technical University of Denmark, Charlottenlund Slot, Jægersborg Allé 1, 2920 Charlottenlund, Denmark		<a href="mailto:cu@aquadtu.dk">cu@aquadtu.dk</a>

Name	Address <sup>1</sup>	Tel.	Email
<b>STECF members</b>			
Vanhee, Willy	ILVO - Institute for Agricultural and Fisheries Research Unit Animal Sciences - Fisheries Ankerstraat 1, B-8400 Oostende, Belgium	Tel 00-32-59-34-22-55 Fax 00-32-59-33-06-29	<a href="mailto:willy.vanhee@ilvo.vlaanderen.be">willy.vanhee@ilvo.vlaanderen.be</a>
van Oostenbrugge, Hans	Landbouweconomisch Instituut-LEI, Fisheries Section, Burg. Patijnlaan 19 P.O.Box 29703 2502 LS The Hague The Netherlands	Tel:+31 (0)70 3358239 Fax: +31 (0)70 3615624	<a href="mailto:Hans.vanOostenbrugge@wur.nl">Hans.vanOostenbrugge@wur.nl</a>

#### EWG-15-10 participants

<b>STECF members</b>		
Name	Address <sup>1</sup>	Email
STRANSKY, Christoph	Thuenen Institute of Sea Fisheries, HAMBURG. Germany	<a href="mailto:christoph.stransky@ti.bund.de">christoph.stransky@ti.bund.de</a>

<b>Invited Experts</b>		
Name	Address	Email
ADAMIDOU, Angeliki	NAGREF-Fisheries Research Institute, KAVALA. Greece	<a href="mailto:adamidou@inale.gr">adamidou@inale.gr</a>
ARMESTO, Angeles	Instituto Espanol de Oceanografia, VIGO. Spain	<a href="mailto:angeles.armesto@vi.ieo.es">angeles.armesto@vi.ieo.es</a>
AVDIC MRAVLJE, Edo	Fisheries research institute of Slovenia. Slovenia	<a href="mailto:edoavdic@gmail.com">edoavdic@gmail.com</a>
BELL, Margaret	Marine Scotland Science, ABERDEEN. United Kingdom	<a href="mailto:m.bell@marlab.ac.uk">m.bell@marlab.ac.uk</a>
BERKENHAGEN, Jörg	Thuenen Institute of Sea Fisheries, HAMBURG. Germany	<a href="mailto:joerg.berkenhagen@ti.bund.de">joerg.berkenhagen@ti.bund.de</a>
BRIGAUDEAU, Cecile	Des requins et de Hommes, LAMPAUL-PLOUARZEL. France	<a href="mailto:cecile@desrequinsetdeshommes.org">cecile@desrequinsetdeshommes.org</a>
CARPENTIERI, Paolo	Maja s.c.ar.l. Italy	<a href="mailto:paolocarpentieri@hotmail.com">paolocarpentieri@hotmail.com</a>
DAVIDJUKA, Irina	Institute of Food Safety- Animal Health and Environment - BIOR, RIGA. Latvia	<a href="mailto:irina.davidjuka@bior.lv">irina.davidjuka@bior.lv</a>
DE BOOIS, Ingeborg	IMARES, IJMUIDEN. Netherlands	<a href="mailto:ingeborg.deboois@wur.nl">ingeborg.deboois@wur.nl</a>
DEGEL, Henrik	DTU-Aqua, ROSKILDE. Denmark	<a href="mailto:hd@aqua.dtu.dk">hd@aqua.dtu.dk</a>
DIAS, Marina	IPMA - Instituto Português do mar e da Atmosfera, LISBOA. Portugal	<a href="mailto:mdias@ipma.pt">mdias@ipma.pt</a>
DINTHEER, CHRISTIAN	IFREMER, NANTES. France	<a href="mailto:christian.dintheer@ifremer.fr">christian.dintheer@ifremer.fr</a>
EBELING, Michael	Thünen Institute for Sea Fisheries, HAMBURG. Germany	<a href="mailto:michaielebeling@t-online.de">michaielebeling@t-online.de</a>
GUIKKEN, Jordi	Spain	<a href="mailto:jordiguillen@hotmail.com">jordiguillen@hotmail.com</a>
JUNG, Armelle	Des requins et des Hommes, LAMPAUL PLOUARZEL. France	<a href="mailto:armelle@desrequinsetdeshommes.org">armelle@desrequinsetdeshommes.org</a>
KAZLAUSKAS, Edvardas	Agricultural nformation and Rural Business Center, VILNIUS. Lithuania	<a href="mailto:edvardas.kazlauskas@vic.lt">edvardas.kazlauskas@vic.lt</a>
NERMER, Tomasz	National Marine Fisheries Research Institute, GDYNIA. Poland	<a href="mailto:nermer@mir.gdynia.pl">nermer@mir.gdynia.pl</a>

NI CHONCHUIR, Grainne	The Marine Institute, CO. GALWAY. Ireland	grainne.nichonchuir@marine.ie
PÖNNI, Jukka	Natural Resources Institute Finland (Luke), HELSINKI. Finland	jukka.ponni@luke.fi
RADU, Gheorghe	National Institute for Marine Research and Development Grigore Antipa, CONSTANTA. Romania	gradu@alpha.rmri.ro
RAYKOV, Violin	IO-BAS, VARNA. Bulgaria	vio_raykov@abv.bg
SABATELLA, Evelina Carmen	NISEA Fisheries and Aquaculture Economic Research, SALERNO. Italy	e.sabatella@nisea.eu
STRANSKY, Christoph	Thuenen Institute of Sea Fisheries, HAMBURG. Germany	christoph.stransky@ti.bund.de
TÄRNLUND, Susanne	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences-Department of Aquatic Resources (SLU Aqua), DROTTNINGHOLM. Sweden	susanne.tarnlund@slu.se
ULLEWEIT, Jens	Thünen Institute of Seafisheries, HAMBURG. Germany	jens.ulleweit@ti.bund.de
VUKOV, Ivana	Ministry of Agriculture of Republic of Croatia - Directorate of Fisheries, ZAGREB. Croatia	ivana.vukov@mps.hr
WARNES Stephen	Self-employed, NORWICH. United Kingdom	stevewarnes44@gmail.com
WOJCİK Ireneusz	National Marine Fisheries Research Institute, GDYNIA. Poland	iwojcik@mir.gdynia.pl

<b>JRC</b>		
Name	Address	<a href="#">Email</a>
CASTRO RIBEIRO Cristina (chairperson)	EC DG JRC, Ispra, Italy	cristina.ribeiro@jrc.ec.europa.eu
MOTOVA Arina	EC DG JRC, Ispra, Italy	arina.motova@jrc.ec.europa.eu

<b>European Commission</b>		
Name	Address	<a href="#">Email</a>
DRUKKER Bas	EC DG MARE, Brussels, Belgium	Bas.Drukker@ec.europa.eu
HOCHMUTH Jennifer	EC DG MARE, Brussels, Belgium	Jennifer.HOCHMUTH@ec.europa.eu
KOSTOPOULOU Venetia	EC DG MARE, Brussels, Belgium	Venetia.KOSTOPOULOU@ec.europa.eu
MOTOVA Arina (STECF secretariat)	JRC, Ispra, Italy	stecf-secretariat@jrc.ec.europa.eu

## 9 LIST OF ANNEXES

Electronic annexes are published on the meeting's web site on:  
<http://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/web/stecf/ewg1510>

List of electronic annexes documents:

1. EWG-15-10 – Annex 1 – AR Evaluation templates. Excel version of annex 2 of the report.
2. EWG-15-10 – Annex 2 – DT Evaluation tables. Excel version of annex 3 of the report.

## 10 LIST OF BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background documents are published on the meeting's web site on:  
<http://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/web/stecf/ewg1510>

List of background documents:

1. EWG-15-10 – Doc 1 - Declarations of invited and JRC experts (see also section 8 of this report – List of participants)
2. EWG-15-10 – Doc 2 - Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) – Review of DCF National programme amendments for 2015 (the 2013 Annual Report for Bulgaria) & development of the revised DCF Multiannual Programme (STECF-15-01). 2015. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, EUR27090 EN, JRC 94538, 89 pp.
3. EWG-15-10 – Doc 3 – List of the derogations under the Data Collection Framework granted to the Member States by the European Commission.
4. EWG-15-10 – Doc 4 – Compilation of the calls for fisheries data under the Data Collection Framework launched in 2014.



## **ANNEX 1 – AGENDA**

**Gdynia, 22-26 Jun 2015**

### **Agenda**

#### **Daily timetable**

Morning session: 9h – 13h (Mon, Tue, Wed, Thu and Fri)

Afternoon Session: 14h – 18h (Mon, Tue, Wed, and Thu)

Breaks: 11h and 16h

#### Monday, 22 June

##### Morning session

Welcome and housekeeping

Presentation & discussion on ToR and agenda (any change to the proposed sub-groups)

Comments from Commission

Hand over from pre-screening

Evaluation process - discussion and joint assessment of one chose AR.

##### Afternoon Session:

Work in sub groups

#### Tuesday, 23 June

##### Morning Session:

Plenary: Summary on work carried out by each SG.

Sub-groups: Tor 1 & 2 in SG (cont.)

##### Afternoon Session:

Sub-groups: Tor 1 & 2 in SG (cont.)

#### Wednesday, 24 June

##### Morning Session:

Plenary: Summary on work carried out by each SG.

Sub-groups: Tor 1 & 2 in SG (cont.)

##### Afternoon Session:

Sub-groups: Tor 1 & 2 in SG (cont.)

#### Thursday, 25 June

##### Morning & Afternoon Sessions:

Plenary: Report by Sub-groups (expected final results to be presented by SG)

Overall compliance exercise AR

Overall compliance exercise DT

Preparation of the outcomes by MS and end-user. (ToR3)

#### Friday, 26 June

##### Morning session

Plenary: Presentation & Discussion on the results on ToR3 and ToR 4

Draft Report

## **ANNEX 2 - TEMPLATE**

Member State:		Member State	Judgement levels			
AR year		2014	Compliance class		Compliance level	
Version of the AR reviewed			No		<10%	
Version of the NP proposal			Partly		10-50%	
			Mostly		50-90%	
		EWG Answer	Yes		>90%	
			NA		not applicable	
Overall compliance						
		Pre-screening comments	Pre-screener 1	Pre-screener 2	EWG judgement	EWG Action needed?
I	General framework	Is Table I.A.1 consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table I.A.2 consistent with AR guidelines?				
II	National data collection organisation					
A	National correspondent and participating institutes	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described? Is there a national DCF website available? Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)? Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?				
B	Regional and International coordination					
B1	Attendance of international meetings	Is Table II.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?				
B2	Follow-up of regional and international recommendations and agreements	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?  In Table II.B.2, are the relevant regional and international recommendations (RCM/s/STECF/LM/Survey Planning Groups) listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?				
III	Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector					
A	General description of the fishing sector	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described? Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?				
B	Economic variables					
	SUPRA-REGION XXX					
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is Table III.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.3 consistent with AR guidelines?				
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?				
B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?				
B4	Actions to avoid deviations	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?				
C	Biological metier related variables					
	Region XXX	Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?				
C1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is Table III.C.1 consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.3 consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 consistent with AR guidelines? Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?				
C2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?				
C4	Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ? Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?				
D	Recreational fisheries	Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region? Is Table III.D.1 consistent with the AR guidelines?				
	Region XXX					
D1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?				
D2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?				
D4	Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ? Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?				
E	Biological stock-related variables	Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?				
	Region XXX					
E1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is Table III.E.1 consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.E.2 consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.E.3 consistent with AR guidelines? Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?				
E2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?				
E4	Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ? Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?				
F	Transversal variables	Is Table III.F.1 consistent with AR guidelines?				
F1	Capacity					
F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?				
F13	Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ? Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?				
F2	Effort					
F21	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?				
F22	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?				
F23	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?				

Member State:		Member State	Judgement levels			
AR year		2014	Compliance class		Compliance level	
Version of the AR reviewed			No		<10%	
Version of the NP proposal			Partly		10-50%	
			Mostly		50-90%	
		EWG Answer	Yes		>90%	
			NA		not applicable	
Overall compliance						
		Pre-screening comments	Pre-screener 1	Pre-screener 2	EWG judgement	EWG Action needed?
I	General framework	Are the responsive actions described ?				
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?				
F24	Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?				
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?				
F3	Landings					
F31	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?				
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?				
		Are the deviations explained?				
		Are the deviations justified?				
F32	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is respective data quality information given?				
		Are the deviations explained?				
		Are the deviations justified?				
F33	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?				
		Are the responsive actions described ?				
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?				
F34	Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?				
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?				
G	Research surveys at sea					
G1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is Table III.G.1 consistent with AR guidelines?				
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?				
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?				
		Are the deviations explained?				
		Are the deviations justified?				
		Is a map of each survey with achieved sampling activities provided?				
G2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?				
		Are the deviations explained?				
		Are the deviations justified?				
G4	Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?				
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?				
IV	Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry					
A	Collection of data concerning the aquaculture	Is Table IV.A.1 consistent with AR guidelines?				
		Is Table IV.A.2 consistent with AR guidelines?				
		Is Table IV.A.3 consistent with AR guidelines?				
A1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?				
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?				
		Are the deviations explained?				
		Are the deviations justified?				
A2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is respective data quality information given?				
		Are the deviations explained?				
		Are the deviations justified?				
A3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?				
		Are the responsive actions described ?				
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?				
A4	Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?				
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?				
B	Collection of data concerning the processing industry	Is Table IV.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?				
		Is Table IV.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?				
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?				
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?				
		Are the deviations explained?				
		Are the deviations justified?				
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is respective data quality information given?				
		Are the deviations explained?				
		Are the deviations justified?				
B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?				
		Are the responsive actions described ?				
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?				
B4	Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?				
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?				
V	Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem					
	1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is Table V.1 consistent with AR guidelines?				
	2 Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described?				
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?				
VI	Module for management and use of the data					
	1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is Table VI.1 consistent with AR guidelines?				
		Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?				
		Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?				
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?				
		Are the deviations explained?				
		Are the deviations justified?				
	2 Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?				
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?				
VII	Follow-up of STECF recommendations (-> dealt with under II.B.2)					
VIII	List of acronyms and abbreviations	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?				
IX	Comments, suggestions and reflections	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?				
X	References	Is there a complete list of references?				
XI	Annexes	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?				
		Are relevant bilateral and/or multilateral agreements included?				

## **ANNEX 3 – ANNUAL REPORT ASSESSMENT**

Member State:		Belgium		
AR year		2014		
Version of the AR reviewed		31 May 2015		
Version of the NP proposal		March/April 2010		
		EWG Answer		
Overall compliance		Partly		
		EWG Comment	EWG judgement	
		EWG - Action needed?		
I	General framework	Some cells are empty (e.g. National Proposal section)	Mostly	Next year and onwards MS to provide a complete table
		Agreement between Belgium and Danemark is missing in the AR	Mostly	MS to clarify about the existence of this agreement
II	National data collection organisation			
A	National correspondent and participating institutes			
	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed.
		No information provided	No	MS to provide information about the existence of the website. Otherwise, MS shall implement a DCF website.
	Is there a national DCF website available?	NA	No	MS to provide information about the existence of the website. Otherwise, MS shall implement a DCF website.
	Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?		No	MS to provide the information on the national coordination meetings. For the future MS should provide minutes of the national coordination meetings.
	Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	NA. Only one partner.	NA	
B	Regional and International coordination			
B1	Attendance of international meetings			
	Is Table II.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	NA	Yes	No action needed
B2	Follow-up of regional and international recommendations and agreements			
	In Table II.B.2, are the relevant regional and international recommendations (RCM's/STECF/LM/Survey Planning Groups) listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
III	Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector			
A	General description of the fishing sector			
	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	No comments	Yes	Table not properly filled. For the future MS to report the table completely fullfil
	Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
B	Economic variables			
	SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea, Eastern Arctic, North Atlantic			
		Planned sample rate is not calculated. Clustered segments not marked with an asterix. Sample rate on inactive vessels shold not be 0	Mostly	MS should fill in III.B.1 according to guidelines and resubmit table
	Is Table III.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Clusters names should not contain merged length classes, but should be marked with asterisk.	Mostly	MS should name segments according to appendix III of DCF regulation and resubmit table
		Sample/response rates do not correspond to figures in IIIB1. Achieved sample rate for census sample survey should be equal to response rate.	Mostly	MS should fill in III.B.3 according to guidelines and resubmit table
	Is Table III.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?			
	Is Table III.B.3 consistent with AR guidelines?			
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	Information given in the text does not match with information in tables: reference year should be 2013 and not 2011.	Mostly	In III.B.1 chapter MS should refer to reference year 2013 and resubmit text of AR
		Some specification in section on "capital value and capital cost" is missing (Price per capacity unit, asset share, lifetime)	Yes	Methods and assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs should be specified according to guidelines. MS should adjust text accordingly and resubmit.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?			
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
B4	Actions to avoid deviations			
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
C	Biological metier related variables			
		It is very difficult to really evaluate the level of achievement for Belgium (planned levels in the NP v's achieved levels in the AR). There appears to be no consistency between the defined sampling frame code and fishing grounds across the NP and the AR ( please see comments on Table III.C.3 for examples). Inconsistencies also exist between the text and the tables within the AR. Belgium appears to be using an old template for the DCF AR text, as it refers to reporting cv's, which is not necessary according to the revised guidelines, and also still has the title "Action to remedy shortfalls", instead of "Action to remedy deviations". The MS also has included details under "Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations" which are not necessary with Table II.B.2	No	MS to resubmit Text and Tables for Module III.C
	Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?			
North Atlantic				
C1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is Table III.C.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Inconsistencies between Region and fishing grounds.	Partly	MS to resubmit Text and Tables for Module III.C
	Is Table III.C.4 consistent with AR guidelines?	Inconsistencies between Region and fishing grounds.	Partly	MS to resubmit Text and Tables for Module III.C

Member State:

Belgium	
AR year	2014
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2015
Version of the NP proposal	March/April 2010
	EWG Answer
Overall compliance	Partly

	EWG Comment	EWG judgement	EWG - Action needed?
	The regions are wrongly reported in Table III.C.3 as "Baltic Sea, North Sea, Eastern Arctic, North Atlantic" all combined. Metiers and sampling frame codes are listed in Table III.C.3 in the NP, and it would appear that the frame codes are a combination of metiers, and sampling strategies, e.g.BEL 01 is the frame code associated with Other - Stock Specific sampling of metier TTB_MCD_70-99_0_0; whereas sampling frame code BEL 02 is ssociated with Concurrent-at-sea (observer)/selfsampling of the same metier. However in the 2014 AR Sampling Frame code BEL 01 is associated with a completely different metier, namely DRB_MOL_0_0_0. Similiar confusion exists for every metier and frame code listed when a comparsion in attempted between the NP and the AR. Another example is: sampling frame code BEL 08: in the NP it encompasses Concurrent-at-sea (observer)/selfsampling for metier TTB_MCD_70-99_0_0, in area VIIe, however in the AR BEL 08 is associated with OTB_DEF_70-99_0_0 OTB_MCD_70-99_0_0 in areas ranging from the North Atlantic to the North Sea and Eastern Arctic.	No	MS to resubmit Text and Tables for Module III.C
Is Table III.C.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	2 bi lateral agreements highlighted in Table I.A.2 with Sweden and UK, but these are not mentioned in Table III.C.6	Mostly	MS to resubmit Text and Tables for Module III.C
Is Table III.C.6 consistent with AR guidelines?	It is not possible to judge the planned v's achieved sampling given all the inconsistencies highlighted above	No	MS to resubmit Text and Tables for Module III.C
Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	It is not possible to judge the planned v's achieved sampling given all the inconsistencies highlighted above	No	MS to resubmit Text and Tables for Module III.C
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Difficult to judge	NA	MS to resubmit Text and Tables for Module III.C
Are the deviations explained?	Difficult to judge	NA	MS to resubmit Text and Tables for Module III.C
Are the deviations justified?			
C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Difficult to judge	NA	MS to resubmit Text and Tables for Module III.C
Are the deviations explained?			
Are the deviations justified?	Difficult to judge	NA	MS to resubmit Text and Tables for Module III.C
C4 Actions to avoid deviations			
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Difficult to judge	NA	MS to resubmit Text and Tables for Module III.C
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Difficult to judge	NA	MS to resubmit Text and Tables for Module III.C

North Sea and Eastern Arctic

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Inconsistencies between Region and fishing grounds.	Partly	MS to resubmit Text and Tables for Module III.C
Is Table III.C.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Inconsistencies between Region and fishing grounds.	Partly	MS to resubmit Text and Tables for Module III.C
Is Table III.C.4 consistent with AR guidelines?	Please see relevant comments for Table III.C.3 under the previous section on the North Atlantic . From Table III.C.3 it is clear that the greatest fishing effort by the Belgian fleet is in the TBB_CRU_16-31_0_0 metier,operating in IV and accounting for 1668 commercial trips in 2014, and yet Belgium has a derogation to sample this metier? Table 1.A.1 refers to this derogation, granted in 2014 with further information in Annex 1 of the AR, however this does not exist. Annex 1 is a document on the collection of economic data. To further confuse the matter, text in the 2014 DCF AR refers to the fact that Belgium is still seeking this derogation, implying that it is currently not approved and therefore Belgium has an obligation to sample this metier. MS is asked to supply the supporting information for this derogation and to confirm if it has been approved and by whom?	No	MS to resubmit Text and Tables for Module III.C
Is Table III.C.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	2 bi lateral agreements highlighted in Table I.A.2 with Sweden and UK, but these are not mentioned in Table III.C.6	Mostly	MS to resubmit Text and Tables for Module III.C
Is Table III.C.6 consistent with AR guidelines?	It is not possible to judge the planned v's achieved sampling given all the inconsistencies highlighted above	No	MS to resubmit Text and Tables for Module III.C
Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?			



Member State:		Belgium			
AR year		2014			
Version of the AR reviewed		31 May 2015			
Version of the NP proposal		March/April 2010			
		EWG Answer			
Overall compliance		Partly			
		EWG Comment	EWG judgement		
			EWG - Action needed?		
C2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	TBB_DEF_70-99_0_0, VIId: Table III.C.3 indicates that 12 concurrent at sea trips and 12 trips ashore were achieved, however the text says something different, indicating that only 80% of the at sea trips were achieved ~9, and also indicates that the shore based targets were exceeded by 100% - MS to clarify what level of sampling was actually achieved. The text refers to at sea and on shore trips being achieved for TBB_DEF_70-99_0_0, IVb,c, (11 at sea and 11 trips ashore were planned according to Table III.C.4) however these trips do not appear in Table III.C.3. The text refers to the metier TBB_DEF_>=120_0_0, saying that only 18 fishing trips were conducted in this metier in 2014, however Table III.C.3 indicates that a total of 248 fishing trips occurred. The Ar text says that this metier was sampled, however no evidence of any sampling appears in Table III.C.3, despite 2.5 concurrent at sea trips being planned and 2.5 sampling trips ashore being planned (no idea how a MS samples 0.5 of a sampling trip??)	No	MS to resubmit Text and Tables for Module III.C	
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?			
		Are the deviations explained?	No	MS to resubmit Text and Tables for Module III.C	
		Are the deviations justified?	No	MS to resubmit Text and Tables for Module III.C	
		Are the deviations explained?	Difficult to judge	MS to resubmit Text and Tables for Module III.C	
		Are the deviations justified?	Difficult to judge	MS to resubmit Text and Tables for Module III.C	
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Difficult to judge	MS to resubmit Text and Tables for Module III.C	
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Difficult to judge	MS to resubmit Text and Tables for Module III.C	
D	Recreational fisheries	Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Is Table III.D.1 consistent with the AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
North Sea and Eastern Arctic					
D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal					
D2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	The text is not clear as to which species are currently covered by the sampling programme	Partly	Text in AR needs revision
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Similar comments were made last year (repetitive issue). The text is confusing, in section III.D.1 the MS mentions that a multi annual sampling program covering all recreational fisheries in fresh and marine waters, directed to cod and sea bass will commence from 2016, however in section III.D.4 it it stated that this sampling programme began in 2014.	Partly	MS is requested to properly describe the multi-annual sampling programme, clarify text and re-submit the AR text for this module.
		Are the deviations explained?	No reference to completeness of the survey, or deviations mentioned nor explained in section III.D.1	No	MS is asked to explain if and why any deviations occurred
		Are the deviations justified?	Cannot judge- no information provided	NA	MS is asked to explain if and why any deviations occurred
		Are the deviations explained?	Only text on database developments available in section III.D.2, and a disclaimer on the preliminary results. No deviations mentioned nor explained	No	MS is requested to provide text on deviations (if any), and explain why deviations occurred
		Are the deviations justified?	Cannot judge- no information provided	NA	MS is requested to provide text on deviations (if any), and explain why deviations occurred
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Text needs clarification and updating; in section III.D.1 the MS mentions that a multi annual sampling program covering all recreational fisheries in fresh and marine waters, directed to cod and sea bass will commence from 2016, however in section III.D.4 it it stated that this sampling programme began in 2014.	Partly	MS is requested to properly describe actions to avoid deviations in this section.
E	Biological stock-related variables	Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	All the regions are combined and reported together, this makes it very difficult to know what has been sampled in the various regions.	Partly	MS to resubmit Tables III.E 1. with sampling reported by individual region and with the supporting text.
North Atlantic					
E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal					
		Is Table III.E.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	All the regions are combined and reported together, this makes it very difficult to know what has been sampled in the various regions.	Partly	MS to resubmit Tables III.E 1. with sampling reported by individual region and with the supporting text.
		Is Table III.E.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	Regions not correct	Mostly	MS to resubmit Tables III.E 2 with the supporting text.
		Is Table III.E.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	Difficult to say	Partly	MS to resubmit Tables III.E 3 with the supporting text.



Member State:

Belgium	
AR year	2014
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2015
Version of the NP proposal	March/April 2010
	EWG Answer
Overall compliance	Partly

		EWG judgement	EWG - Action needed?
E2	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	Difficult to say	MS to resubmit all the Tables in module III.E with the supporting text.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	MS to resubmit all the Tables in module III.E with the supporting text.
	Are the deviations explained?	Partly	MS to clarify
	Are the deviations justified?	Partly	MS to clarify
	Are the deviations explained?	Partly	MS to clarify
E4	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Partly	MS to clarify for under sampling and where no sampling has occurred.
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Partly	MS to clarify for under sampling and where no sampling has occurred.
	Is Table III.E.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	MS to resubmit Tables III.E 1. with sampling reported by individual region and with the supporting text.
	Is Table III.E.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	MS to resubmit Tables III.E 2 with the supporting text.
	Is Table III.E.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	MS to resubmit Tables III.E 3 with the supporting text.
E1	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	MS to clarify if there is an obligation to collection biological parameters for both Lophius and Merluccius species, and then to clarify what sampling has actually been completed.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	MS to provide explanations for the significant under sampling.
	Are the deviations explained?	Partly	MS to provide explanations for the significant under sampling.
	Are the deviations justified?	Partly	MS to provide explanations for the significant under sampling.
	Are the deviations explained?	Partly	MS to provide explanations for the significant under sampling.
E2	Are the deviations explained?	Partly	MS to clarify
	Are the deviations justified?	Partly	MS to clarify
E4	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Partly	MS to clarify

**Member State:**

<b>Belgium</b>	
AR year	<b>2014</b>
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2015
Version of the NP proposal	March/April 2010
	<b>EWG Answer</b>
<b>Overall compliance</b>	<b>Partly</b>

		EWG					
		EWG Comment	judgement	EWG - Action needed?			
F	Transversal variables		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Difficult to judge	Partly	MS to clarify	
	F1	Capacity	F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Not all transversal variables are listed (number of nets for DFN, hours fished for dredgers and trawls, prices by commercial species). No derogations listed in table IA1	Mostly	MS is requested to resubmit a completed table.
				Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
				Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
				Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	F13	Actions to avoid deviations	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
			Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed	
			Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed	
	F2	Effort	F21	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Mostly. Not all variables collected (see comment on table IIIF1). No derogation requested.	Mostly	MS is requested to resubmit a completed table.
Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?				No comments	Yes	No action needed	
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?				No comments	NA	No action needed	
Are the deviations explained?				No comments	NA	No action needed	
F22		Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
			Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
			Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
F23		Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No action needed	
			Are the responsive actions described ?	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No action needed	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No action needed		
F24	Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed		
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed		
F3	Landings	F31	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Prices by commercial species not collected. No derogation requested or accepted	Mostly	MS is requested to resubmit a completed table.	
			Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
			Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
	F32	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
			Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
			Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
	F33	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No action needed	
			Are the responsive actions described ?	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No action needed	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?			Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No action needed		
F34	Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed		
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed		
G	Research surveys at sea						
	G1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is Table III.G.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Minor issue in Table III.G.1: footnote (a) in cell P5 not explained	Yes	No action needed	
			Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	NP target for DYFS was 10 days, but is now 8 days	Mostly	No action needed	
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	no comment	Yes	No action needed	
			Are the deviations explained?	BTS (repetitive issue): no DATRAS upload yet, repetitive issue, see AR2013 evaluation; DYFS: No upload to DATRAS yet, will be done "as soon as database for hosting inshore trawl survey data is set up" according to MS in AR text; )	Mostly	MS to upload offshore beam trawl survey data to DATRAS	
	G2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Are the deviations justified?	BTS: Clarification on failure to upload to DATRAS needed.	Partly	MS to clarify failure to upload to DATRAS	
			Is a map of each survey with achieved sampling activities provided?	Reference Map numbers in the text should be changed/added as needed	Yes	Map numbers in the text should be changed/added	
			Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	No survey indices provided	NA	No action needed	
			Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	G4	Actions to avoid deviations	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?			Cannot judge- no information provided	NA	No action needed		
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?			Cannot judge- no information provided	NA	No action needed		
Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry							
A	Collection of data concerning the aquaculture						
	A1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is Table IV.A.1 consistent with AR guidelines	Even if a derogation is given for not sampling of aquaculture economic data, table should be presented fully! Entries should be yes, no or NS for non sampling.	Mostly	MS should fill in IV.A.1 according to guidelines and resubmit table	
			Is Table IV.A.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
			Is Table IV.A.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	NA	No action needed	

Member State:		Belgium			
AR year		2014			
Version of the AR reviewed		31 May 2015			
Version of the NP proposal		March/April 2010			
		EWG Answer			
Overall compliance		Partly			
		EWG Comment	EWG judgement	EWG - Action needed?	
A2	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal					
A3	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations				
A4	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
	Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
	Actions to avoid deviations				
B	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
Collection of data concerning the processing industry					
B1	Is Table IV.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	MS does not provide quality and sampling information by segments	Mostly	MS should fill in IV.B.1 according to guidelines and provide information sepataely on each segment, resubmit table	
	Is Table IV.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	Clumn H should contain information on segment, not numbers.	Yes	MS should fill in IV.B.2 according to guidelines and resubmit table. Segments can be reported as "all segments" in the case the sampling strategy is the same for all segments, otherwise MS should specify the segments for which a specific sampling strategy has been used	
	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
B2	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	An improvement compared to former years although response rate is still too low for a census.	Yes	MS should consider SBS as data source for current low response rate survey.	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal					
B3	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations				
B4	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
	Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
	Actions to avoid deviations				
V	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem					
1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal					
2	Is Table V.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Actions to avoid deviations				
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed	
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed	
Module for management and use of the data					
1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal					
2	Is Table VI.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Table is not clear. What does 'A' mean? What do the different colours mean? Which expert group is meant by 'data call JRC 2013&2014'? Internal comment in cell B347: PASVIS.	Mostly	MS to resubmit the table VI.1 according to the guidelines and with the appropriate changes.	
	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed	
	Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed	
	Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No action needed	
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed	
	Actions to avoid deviations				
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	NA	NA	No action needed	
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?		NA	NA	No action needed	
Follow-up of STECF recommendations					
List of acronyms and abbreviations					
IX	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Comments, suggestions and reflections				
X	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	References				
XI	Is there a complete list of references?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Annexes				
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	E-mail by Amelie Knapp copied in, should be Annex 5.	Yes	No action needed	
	Are relevant bilateral and/or multilateral agreements included?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	



Member State:		Bulgaria	
AR year		2014	
Version of the AR reviewed		31 May 2015	
Version of the NP proposal		31 March 2010	
		EWG Answer	
Overall compliance		Partly	

<b>Member State:</b>	<b>Bulgaria</b>
AR year	<b>2014</b>
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2015
Version of the NP proposal	31 March 2010
	<b>EWG Answer</b>
<b>Overall compliance</b>	<b>Partly</b>

		EWG Comment	EWG judgement	EWG - Action needed?
C	<b>Biological metier related variables</b>  <b>Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea</b>	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Cannot judge- no information provided	No MS should describe actions to avoid deviations.
		Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	No comments	Yes No action needed
C1	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
		Is Table III.C.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	MS should 1. apply the correct reference period, 2. apply the correct rankning system and 3. update the metier naming accordingn to RCM reference list and check the consistancy between AR and NP. MS should then resubmit table III.C.1 . MS should also check the whole set of III.C tables for internal consistency and resubmit the complete set of III.C tables. MS is also requested to update the text accordingly when necessary.
		Is Table III.C.4 consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	"Sampling year" should refer to the year for achieved sampling (2014). "Sampling frame code" is not correct, it should match with code reported in table III.C.3. Poor internal consistency between the III.C-tables in general. MS should also check the whole set of III.C tables for internal consistency and resubmit the complete set of III.C tables. MS is also requested to update the text accordingly when necessary.
		Is Table III.C.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	"Sampling year" should refer to the year for achieved sampling (2014). Poor internal consistency between the III.C-tables in general. Regarding the low number of trips (8) achieved it can be questioned if the table has been completed. MS should change "Sampling year". MS should also check the whole set of III.C tables for internal consistency and resubmit the complete set of III.C tables. MS is also requested to update the text accordingly when necessary.
		Is Table III.C.6 consistent with AR guidelines?	No	"Sampling year" should refer to the year for achieved sampling (2014). Poor internal consistency between the III.C-tables in general. Only two species are reported (from the 8 trips). and no length measurements seem to have been obtained, which is not likely to be correct!!! MS should change "Sampling year". MS should also check the whole set of III.C tables for internal consistency and resubmit the complete set of III.C tables. MS is also requested to update the text accordingly when necessary.
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No	Partly. MS did not apply concurrent sampling strategy. Besides, only two species out of seven in NP were listed as sampled (although no data were recorded for these). MS should correct and resubmit the complete set of III.C tables in AR. MS is also requested to update the text accordingly when necessary.
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	Only 8 trips have been carried out on a total of 112 planned and only OTM_MPD sampled on shore (no at sea sampling carried out) with an achievement rate of 26% fot this metier. The 3 other planned metiers were not sampled at all in 2014. MS should check that the earlier reported achievments are correct.
		Are the deviations explained?	No	Cannot judge, no information given. MS should provide explanation when resubmitting the text.
		Are the deviations justified?	No	Cannot judge, no information given. MS should provide justifications when resubmitting the text.
C2	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	Are the deviations explained?	Cannot judge, no relevant information given.	No MS should provide explanation when resubmitting the text.
		Are the deviations justified?	Cannot judge, no relevant information given.	No MS should provide justifications when resubmitting the text.
C4	<b>Actions to avoid deviations</b>	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Cannot judge, no relevant information given.	No MS should provide actions to avoid shortfalls when resubmitting the text.
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	NA	NA
D	<b>Recreational fisheries</b>	Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?	No comments	Yes No action needed
		Is Table III.D.1 consistent with the AR guidelines?	Column "Applicable" with always NO is not consistent with NP text and table I.A.1 where derogation was rejected.; Column RFMO not filled in correctly	Mostly AR2015: MS is requested to fill in RFMO correctly and bring column "Applicable" in line with derogation table
D1	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes No action needed
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA No action needed
D2	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	Are the deviations explained?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA No action needed
D4	<b>Actions to avoid deviations</b>	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA No action needed
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA No action needed
E	<b>Biological stock-related variables</b>  <b>Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea</b>	Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	No comments	Yes No action needed
E1	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	Is Table III.E.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly. There is a mismatch between the species reported in this table and the ones present in table III.E.2. Scopthalmus maximus and Mullus barbatus have been selcted here but are not present in table III.E.2, on the contrary in table III.E.2 it is reported Psetta maxima not present in table III.E.1. Squalus acanthias it is mentioned in both tables but not in the text. MS should carefully check it. 6 species selected, three of them with landings <50 t.	Partly MS should check the whole set of III.E tables for internal consistency as well as compliment to the guidelines and resubmit the complete set of III.E tables. MS is also requested to update the text accordingly when necessary.



Member State:		Bulgaria	
	AR year		2014
	Version of the AR reviewed		31 May 2015
	Version of the NP proposal		31 March 2010
		EWG Answer	
	Overall compliance	Partly	

<b>Member State:</b>	<b>Bulgaria</b>
<b>AR year</b>	<b>2014</b>
<b>Version of the AR reviewed</b>	31 May 2015
<b>Version of the NP proposal</b>	31 March 2010
	<b>EWG Answer</b>
<b>Overall compliance</b>	<b>Partly</b>

		EWG Comment	EWG judgement	EWG - Action needed?
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	Acoustic and bottom trawl survey in April-June not conducted (only 2 out of 4 planned surveys achieved)	Partly	No action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Acoustic and bottom trawl survey in April-June not conducted (only 2 out of 4 planned surveys achieved)	Partly	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	Financial problems	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is a map of each survey with achieved sampling activities provided?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<b>G2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Acoustic and bottom trawl survey in April-June not conducted (only 2 out of 4 planned surveys achieved)	Partly	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	Financial problems	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?			
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
<b>G4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid deviations</b>	Yes	Yes	No action needed
<b>IV Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry</b>				
<b>A Collection of data concerning the aquaculture</b>				
	Is Table IV.A.1 consistent with AR guidelines	Cells from template shall not be removed.	Mostly	MS should resubmit the table IV.A.1 with all species.
		Table filled not according to the guidelines. Total population presented not by segments, reference year should be 2013. For some segments, achieved sample rate as well as planned sample number from frame population is questionable.	Partly	MS should fix and resubmit the table IV.A.2.
	Is Table IV.A.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	Reference year should be 2013. Some variables as number of persons employed, FTE national and number of enterprises are missing. Response rate for type of data collection 'C' calculated not according to the guidelines. The data should be provided by segment.	Partly	MS should fix and resubmit the table IV.A.3.
	Is Table IV.A.3 consistent with AR guidelines?			
	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	Standard tables is defined type of data collection as 'B', in text is stated that Bulgaria will use type of data collection 'A': Census whereas in AR indicates that 'C' was applied.	Partly	MS should clarify the reason of type of data collection changing.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Achievements regarding the change of sampling scheme are not explained in text.	Partly	MS should provide the explanation.
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	No	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is respective data quality information given?	No information on the reason to change type of survey.	Partly	MS should provide the explanation.
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	No	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Bulgaria refers to the participation in the meetings in 2014. However MS should be aware about the reports of relevant meetings and follow methodological development.	No	MS should take into account relevant recommendations from LM and RCM meetings.
	Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	No	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.
	Actions to avoid deviations			
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	The actions provided to avoid deviations are not relevant.	Partly	MS should provide more information.
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	The actions provided to avoid deviations are not relevant.	No	MS should provide more information.
<b>B Collection of data concerning the processing industry</b>				
	Is Table IV.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Reference year should be 2013. Planned sample number does not logically correspond to frame population. How is possible to gather 25 samples from 2 population numbers?	Partly	MS should resubmit the table IV.B.1
	Is Table IV.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	Reference year is not correct. Employment data and number of enterprises are missing.	Partly	MS should resubmit the table IV.B.2
	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	Type of data collection is not consistent to NP. It was planned to use a census and probability sample survey, but non probability sample survey was carried out.	No	MS should clarify the reason of type of data collection changing
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Achievements regarding to the changes of sampling scheme is not explained in text.	Partly	MS should provide the explanation.
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	No	MS should provide the explanation.
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	MS should provide the explanation.
	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is respective data quality information given?	No information provided on changed type of survey.	Partly	MS should provide the explanation.
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	No	MS should provide the explanation.
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	MS should provide the explanation.
	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Bulgaria refers to the participation in the meetings in 2014. However MS should be aware about the reports of relevant meetings and follow methodological development.	No	MS should take into account relevant recommendations from LM and RCM meetings.
	Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	No	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.
	Actions to avoid deviations			
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed

Member State:	Bulgaria		
	AR year	2014	
	Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2015	
	Version of the NP proposal	31 March 2010	
		EWG Answer	
Overall compliance	Partly		

	EWG Comment	EWG judgement	EWG - Action needed?
V Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem			
1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Is Table V.1 consistent with AR guidelines?			
2 Actions to avoid deviations	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
VI Module for management and use of the data			
1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
Is Table VI.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	In column B, not the organisation, but the relevant Expert /Working Groups should be listed.	Yes	In the future MS to report the relevant Expert/Working Groups.
Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	With information of addition quantities, length and age composition of discards.	Yes	No action needed.
Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	It is not clear if the Data base was fully operative.	Partly	MS should provide operative data base.
Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed.
Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed.
2 Actions to avoid deviations			
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed.
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed.
VII Follow-up of STECF recommendations (-> dealt with under II.B.2)			
VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations			
Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed
IX Comments, suggestions and reflections			
Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	No comments	NA	No actions needed
X References			
Is there a complete list of references?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed
XI Annexes			
Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed
Are relevant bilateral and/or multilateral agreements included?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed



<b>Member State:</b>		<b>Croatia</b>	
<b>AR year</b>		<b>2014</b>	
<b>Version of the AR reviewed</b>		31 May 2015	
<b>Version of the NP proposal</b>		NP 2011-2013 amended for 2013 - May 2013	
		<b>EWG Answer</b>	
<b>Overall compliance</b>		<b>Yes</b>	
		<b>EWG Comment</b>	<b>EWG judgement</b>
			<b>EWG - Action needed?</b>
<b>I General framework</b>			
	Is Table I.A.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments.	Yes
	Is Table I.A.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments.	Yes
<b>II National data collection organisation</b>			
<b>A National correspondent and participating institutes</b>			
	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	No comments.	Yes
	Is there a national DCF website available?	No comments.	Yes
	Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?	No comments.	NA
	Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	No comments.	Yes
<b>B Regional and International coordination</b>			
<b>B1 Attendance of international meetings</b>			
	Is Table II.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments.	Yes
	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	No comments.	NA
<b>B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations and agreements</b>			
	In Table II.B.2, are the relevant regional and international recommendations (RCM's/STECF/LM/Survey Planning Groups) listed?	No comments. List could be reduced to 2013 recommendations.	Yes
	Are the responsive actions described?	No comments.	Yes
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments.	Yes
<b>III Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector</b>			
<b>A General description of the fishing sector</b>			
	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	No comments.	Yes
<b>B Economic variables</b>			
	Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?	No comments.	NA
<b>SUPRA-REGION Mediterranean and Black Sea</b>			
	Is Table III.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments.	Yes
	Is Table III.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments.	Yes
	Is Table III.B.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	Response rate should be provided as %. Response rates is missing for some variables	Mostly
<b>B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	In 2014 Croatia reviewed data for 2011-2013; revised estimation procedures are described.	Yes
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments.	Yes
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments.	Yes
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments.	Yes
<b>B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments.	Yes
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments.	Yes
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments.	Yes
<b>B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA
	Are the responsive actions described?	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA
<b>B4 Actions to avoid deviations</b>			
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments.	Yes
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments.	Yes
<b>C Biological metier related variables</b>			
	Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	No comments.	Yes
<b>Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea</b>			
<b>C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Is Table III.C.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Some metiers signed with asterisks in the Table III.C.1 but with no capitation. According to the guidelines, all the comments must be inserted in the last column of the table. Ranking list of metiers has been updated in the table.	Mostly
	Is Table III.C.4 consistent with AR guidelines?	MS must avoid duplicating rows for the same sampling frame: Planned no. trips to be sampled at sea by MS (column N) and Planned no. trips to be sampled on shore by MS column (O) for each sampling frame should be in the same line avoiding duplication in Planned total no. Trips to be sampled by MS (N+O) (column P). Sampling frame (geographical location) is not specified.	Mostly
	Is Table III.C.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments.	Yes
	Is Table III.C.6 consistent with AR guidelines?	According to table III.C.6 length sampling by species was achieved for 7 metiers, while 10 metier were actually achieved according to table III.C.3. MS planned to do concurrent sampling at sea and on shore (scheme 2) but data provided in table III.C.6 only refers to most commercial species: only 18 species sampled for length out of 86 fishing trips sampled at sea and 291 fishing trips sampled on-shore.	Mostly
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments.	Yes

<b>Member State:</b>	<b>Croatia</b>
<b>AR year</b>	<b>2014</b>
<b>Version of the AR reviewed</b>	31 May 2015
<b>Version of the NP proposal</b>	NP 2011-2013 amended for 2013 - May 2013
	<b>EWG Answer</b>
<b>Overall compliance</b>	<b>Yes</b>

		EWG Comment	EWG judgement	EWG - Action needed?
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Good achievement rates for most metiers. Distribution between at sea and on shore samplings in general respected.	Yes	No action needed.
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
<b>C2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Are the deviations explained?	No information on data quality is reported, but no deviations were observed.	NA	No action needed.
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments.	NA	No action needed.
<b>C4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid deviations</b>			
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments.	NA	No action needed.
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments.	NA	No action needed.
<b>D</b>	<b>Recreational fisheries</b>			
	Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
	Is Table III.D.1 consistent with the AR guidelines?	Table not consistent with AR text and table I.A.1 where an approved derogation for eel and sharks is mentioned.	Mostly	Resubmit Table III.D.1 for approved derogations on eel and sharks, as is stated in Table I.A.1 (update column G in table III.D.1)
<b>Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea</b>				
<b>D1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<b>D2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
<b>D4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid deviations</b>			
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
<b>E</b>	<b>Biological stock-related variables</b>			
	Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
<b>Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea</b>				
<b>E1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Is Table III.E.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Footnotes should be reported in the appropriate column (column "Comments").	Yes	Next year and onwards MS must submit the AR tables fulfilled according to the guidelines.
	Is Table III.E.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
	Is Table III.E.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments.	NA	No action needed.
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments.	NA	No action needed.
<b>E2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments.	NA	No action needed.
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments.	NA	No action needed.
<b>E4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid deviations</b>			
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments.	NA	No action needed.
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments.	NA	No action needed.
<b>F</b>	<b>Transversal variables</b>			
	Is Table III.F.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments.	Yes	MS should exclude expenditure and income variables from table IIIF1i in the future.
<b>F1</b>	<b>Capacity</b>			
<b>F11</b>	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments.	NA	No action needed.
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments.	NA	No action needed.
<b>F13</b>	Actions to avoid deviations			
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed.
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed.
<b>F2</b>	<b>Effort</b>			
<b>F21</b>	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments.	NA	No action needed.
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments.	NA	No action needed.
<b>F22</b>	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments.	NA	No action needed.
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments.	NA	No action needed.
<b>F23</b>	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No action needed.
	Are the responsive actions described ?	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No action needed.
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No action needed.
<b>F24</b>	Actions to avoid deviations			

<b>Member State:</b>	<b>Croatia</b>
AR year	<b>2014</b>
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2015
Version of the NP proposal	NP 2011-2013 amended for 2013 - May 2013
	<b>EWG Answer</b>
<b>Overall compliance</b>	<b>Yes</b>

		EWG Comment	EWG judgement	EWG - Action needed?	
F3	Landings	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed.
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed.
	F31	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments.	NA	No action needed.
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments.	NA	No action needed.
	F32	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.	
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments.	NA	No action needed.	
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments.	NA	No action needed.	
F33	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations				
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No action needed.
		Are the responsive actions described ?	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No action needed.
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No action needed.
	F34	Actions to avoid deviations			
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed.
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed.
	Research surveys at sea				
G1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
		Is Table III.G.1 consistent with AR guidelines?			
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	MEDIAS: no. of hauls planned was 50 according to NP, strange percentages in column T (should be achieved/planned target and not related to max. days eligible). Wrong reference to Annex II (which doesn't exist) in column N.	Mostly	AR2015 and onwards: MS is requested to refer correctly to maps (the maps are in the in text, not in Annex II), to put correct percentages in column T. If no specific target is set, the achievement should be 100%. Fill in planned target according to NP (MEDIAS fish hauls=50)
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed
			Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	
		Is a map of each survey with achieved sampling activities provided?	Fish hauls and CTD stations not incorporated in map although referred to in Table III.G.1	Mostly	AR2015: MS is requested to add CTD stations and fish hauls to map MEDIAS
	G2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?		Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed
G4		Actions to avoid deviations	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed
le of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry					
Collection of data concerning the aquaculture					
A1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is Table IV.A.1 consistent with AR guidelines	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
		Is Table IV.A.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
		Is Table IV.A.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
	A2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.	
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.	
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.	
A3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations				
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments.	NA	No action needed.	
	Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments.	NA	No action needed.	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments.	NA	No action needed.	
A4	Actions to avoid deviations				
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.	
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.	
Collection of data concerning the processing industry					
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is Table IV.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
		Is Table IV.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
	B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.	
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.	



<b>Member State:</b>	<b>Croatia</b>
<b>AR year</b>	<b>2014</b>
<b>Version of the AR reviewed</b>	31 May 2015
<b>Version of the NP proposal</b>	NP 2011-2013 amended for 2013 - May 2013
	<b>EWG Answer</b>
<b>Overall compliance</b>	<b>Yes</b>

  

	<b>EWG Comment</b>	<b>EWG judgement</b>	<b>EWG - Action needed?</b>
<b>B3</b> Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments.	NA	No action needed.
Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments.	NA	No action needed.
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments.	NA	No action needed.
<b>B4</b> Actions to avoid deviations			
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
<b>V Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem</b>			
1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
Is Table V.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed
2 Actions to avoid deviations			
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described?	No comments.	NA	No action needed
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments.	NA	No action needed
<b>VI Module for management and use of the data</b>			
1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
Is Table VI.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
Are the deviations explained?	No comments.	NA	No action needed.
Are the deviations justified?	No comments.	NA	No action needed.
2 Actions to avoid deviations			
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments.	NA	No action needed.
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments.	NA	No action needed.
<b>VII Follow-up of STECF recomm (-&gt; dealt with under II.B.2)</b>			
<b>VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations</b>			
Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
<b>IX Comments, suggestions and reflections</b>			
Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
<b>X References</b>			
Is there a complete list of references?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
<b>XI Annexes</b>			
Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	No comments.	Yes	No action needed.
Are relevant bilateral and/or multilateral agreements included?	No comments.	NA	No action needed.

Member State:		Cyprus					
AR year		2014					
Version of the AR reviewed		May 2015					
Version of the NP proposal		NP 2011-2013 - May 2010					
		EWG Answer					
Overall compliance		Mostly					
		EWG Comment	EWG judgement				
		EWG - Action needed?					
I	General framework	Is Table I.A.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed.		
			Table is incomplete. Information on coordination, description of sampling, data transmission, costs and access to vessels is missing.	Partly	MS is requested to resubmit the table.		
II	National data collection organisation						
	A	National correspondent and participating institutes					
		Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed.		
			The EWG acknowledge the additional information provided by the MS which is in-line with the group comment from previous year, however the timeline for the implementation should be within 2015.	No	MS shall implement a DCF website until the end of current year.		
		Is there a national DCF website available? Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?	No comments	No	MS shall implement a DCF website until the end of current year.		
		Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	There's very little information given about the meeting.	Mostly	In future reports MS must provide additional information according to Reg 665/2008, art.3.3.		
	B	Regional and International coordination					
		B1	Attendance of international meetings				
			Is Table II.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines? Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed.	
		B2	Follow-up of regional and international recommendations and agreements				
	In Table II.B.2, are the relevant regional and international recommendations (RCM's/STECF/LM/Survey Planning Groups) listed?		Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No action needed.		
	Are the responsive actions described?		Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No action needed.		
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No action needed.		
	III	Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector					
A		General description of the fishing sector					
		Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed		
B		Economic variables	Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		SUPRA-REGION Mediterranean and Black Sea					
			Is Table III.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	The number of vessels is about 400 more than the fleet register	Partly	The MS is requested to provide a new table, without double counting the vessels and having the fleet register as target population. The text from the AR must be ammended accordingly.	
			Is Table III.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	Sums of unclusterd segments do not match with numbers in clustered segments Data in the segments should only refer to active vessels	Partly	The MS is requested to provide a new table, without double counting the vessels and using the fleet register as target population. The text from the AR must be ammended accordingly.	
			Is Table III.B.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	For sake of completeness the variables income and costs from fishing rights should be listed even if not applicable.	Yes	Next year and onwards these variables must be included in the table.	
		B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
				Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No acction needed
					No comments	Yes	No acction needed
					No comments	NA	No acction needed
			No comments	NA	No acction needed		
B2		Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal					
			Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
				No comments	NA	No action needed	
B3		Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations					
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No action needed		
		Are the responsive actions described?	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No action needed		
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No action needed			
B4	Actions to avoid deviations						
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ? Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed		
		Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed			
C	Biological metier related variables						
		Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	No comment	Yes	No action needed		
Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea							
C1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal						
		Is Table III.C.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comment	Yes	Next year and onward MS must shade the lines with the selected Metiers.		
		Is Table III.C.4 consistent with AR guidelines?	No commnts	Yes	No action needed.		
		Is Table III.C.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No commnts	Yes	No action needed.		
			It's not clear from the tables that concurrent sampling scheme 1 has been implemented for LP metiers.	Yes	MS is requested to clarify if concurrent sampling scheme 1 is being applied for LP metiers.		
		Is Table III.C.6 consistent with AR guidelines?					





<b>Member State:</b>	<b>Cyprus</b>	
	AR year	<b>2014</b>
	Version of the AR reviewed	May 2015
	Version of the NP proposal	NP 2011-2013 - May 2010
		<b>EWG Answer</b>
	<b>Overall compliance</b>	<b>Mostly</b>

		EWG Comment	EWG judgement	EWG - Action needed?
F24	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments.	NA	No actions needed.
	Actions to avoid deviations			
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments.	NA	No actions needed.
F3	Landings			
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments.	NA	No actions needed.
F31	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
F32	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments.	Yes	No actions needed.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments.	Yes	No actions needed.
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments.	NA	No actions needed.
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments.	NA	No actions needed.
	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
F33	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments.	Yes	No actions needed.
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments.	NA	No actions needed.
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments.	NA	No actions needed.
	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments.	NA	No actions needed.
F34	Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments.	NA	No actions needed.
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments.	NA	No actions needed.
	Actions to avoid deviations			
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments.	NA	No actions needed.
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments.	NA	No actions needed.
<b>Research surveys at sea</b>				
G1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
G2	Is Table III.G.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comment	Yes	No action needed.
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comment	No	No action needed.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comment	No	No action needed.
	Are the deviations explained?	No comment	Yes	No action needed.
	Are the deviations justified?	No comment	Yes	No action needed.
	Is a map of each survey with achieved sampling activities provided?			
		No comment	NA	No action needed.
	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	There is no information given about the effect the non conduction of the survey might have on the indices.	No	MS is requested to provide additional information on the impact this has on the indices.
G4	Are the deviations explained?	No comment	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comment	NA	No action needed
	Actions to avoid deviations			
G4	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Yes	Yes	No action needed.
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed.
<b>le of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry</b>				
<b>Collection of data concerning the aquaculture</b>				
A1	Is Table IV.A.1 consistent with AR guidelines	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table IV.A.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table IV.A.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
A2	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
A3	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed
A4	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Actions to avoid deviations			
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
<b>Collection of data concerning the processing industry</b>				
B1	Is Table IV.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table IV.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
B2	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	It is not clear from the text and the figures in the tables whether these additional companies have been included or not. The report doesn't render enoughly clear.	Mostly	MS must clarify and correct the table and the text accordingly with the DCF definitions.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
B3	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
B3	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed

Member State:	Cyprus	
	AR year	2014
	Version of the AR reviewed	May 2015
	Version of the NP proposal	NP 2011-2013 - May 2010
		EWG Answer
Overall compliance	Mostly	

		EWG	
	EWG Comment	judgement	EWG - Action needed?
B4    Actions to avoid deviations	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA No action needed
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	NA No action needed
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA No action needed
V    Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem			
1    Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is Table V.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes No action needed
2    Actions to avoid deviations			
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described?	Mostly	Mostly The description of the actions to take for the future is too vague to be judged.
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Mostly	Mostly The description of the actions to take for the future is too vague to be judged.
VI    Module for management and use of the data			
1    Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is Table VI.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes No action needed
	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes No action needed
	Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	No comments	Yes No action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA No action needed
2    Actions to avoid deviations			
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	NA No action needed
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA No action needed
VII    Follow-up of STECF recomme (-> dealt with under II.B.2)			
VIII    List of acronyms and abbreviations			
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comments	Yes No action needed
IX    Comments, suggestions and reflections			
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	No comments	No No action needed
X    References			
	Is there a complete list of references?	No comments	Yes No action needed
XI    Annexes			
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	No comments	Yes No action needed
	Are relevant bilateral and/or multilateral agreements included?	No comments	Yes No action needed



<b>Member State:</b>		<b>Denmark</b>	
<b>AR year</b>		<b>2014</b>	
<b>Version of the AR reviewed</b>		31 May 2015	
<b>Version of the NP proposal</b>		31 Oct 2011	
		<b>EWG Answer</b>	
<b>Overall compliance</b>		<b>Mostly</b>	
		<b>EWG Comment</b>	<b>EWG judgement</b> <b>EWG - Action needed?</b>
<b>I General framework</b>		Is Table I.A.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments Yes No action needed.
		Is Table I.A.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments Yes No action needed.
<b>II National data collection organisation</b>			
<b>A National correspondent and participating institutes</b>		Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	No comments Yes No action needed.
		Is there a national DCF website available?	Hyperlink to it could be added Yes No action needed.For the future MS to provide link of the website.
		Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?	NA NA No action needed
		Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	No comments. Yes For the future MS should provide minutes of the national cooordination meetings.
<b>B Regional and International coordination</b>			
<b>B1 Attendance of international meetings</b>		Is Table II.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	
		Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	North Atlantic RCM meeting is missing. Yes MS to explain why they haven't participate to the North Atlantic RCM meeting.
			NA NA No action needed.
<b>B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations and agreements</b>		In Table II.B.2, are the relevant regional and international recommendations (RCM's/STECF/LM/Survey Planning Groups) listed?	
		Are the responsive actions described?	No comments Yes No action needed.
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments Yes No action needed.
<b>III Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector</b>			
<b>A General description of the fishing sector</b>		Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	No comments Yes No action needed.
<b>B Economic variables</b>		Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?	No Comments Yes No action needed.
<b>SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea, Eastern Arctic, North Atlantic</b>			
		Is Table III.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Clustered segments not indicated with an asterisk. About 700 vessels less than in fleet register Mostly MS has to justify 700 vessels missing from the population and update the reference year by resubmitting the table III.B.1, as well as to mark clustered segments with an asterisk.
		Is Table III.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	Inactive vessels > 40 m are wrongly reported (reference year 2012). Yes No actions needed
		Is Table III.B.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments Yes No actions needed
<b>B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments Yes No actions needed
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments Yes No actions needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments NA No actions needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments NA No actions needed
<b>B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		Is respective data quality information given?	No comments Yes No actions needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments NA No actions needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments NA No actions needed
<b>B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments NA No actions needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	No comments NA No actions needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments NA No actions needed
<b>B4 Actions to avoid deviations</b>		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments NA No actions needed
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments NA No actions needed
<b>C Biological metier related variables</b>		Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	no comment yes no action required
<b>Baltic</b>			
<b>C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		Is Table III.C.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	no comment yes no action required
		Is Table III.C.4 consistent with AR guidelines?	no comment yes no action required
		Is Table III.C.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	no comment yes no action required
			Column C empty , NP and AR reference year missing, and metiers coding not consistent with reference metiers list (DNK should not precede metier name). Data provided for more metiers than planned in III.C.1. There is a mis-match between IIIC1, IIIC3 and IIIC6 mostly For next year MS must ensure consistency in the tables and include headings
		Is Table III.C.6 consistent with AR guidelines?	The sampling scheme has changed from the original NP to randomised sampling in line with recommendations on Statistically Sound Sampling schemes. yes no action required
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	The majority of planned metier sampling targets were not achieved. With the change to 4S sampling strategy, metiers are not targetted now. partly Although MS has moved to 4S sampling, they are encouraged to improve the logistics of their sampling plan, which appeared to be problematic in 2014.
		Are the deviations explained?	no comment yes no action required
			Numbers of achieved trips both at sea and ashore were significantly lower than was planned in the NP. moving towards 4S is given as the reason, lots of logistical problems, however this only partly explains the under achievement of trips. partly Although MS has moved to 4S sampling, they are encouraged to improve the logistics of their sampling plan, which appeared to be problematic in 2014.
<b>C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		Are the deviations justified?	
		Are the deviations explained?	MS only reports on the changes in sampling strategy rather than on the quality of the data that has occurred when changing to probability sampling. mostly From next year, details of the data quality is requested

Member State:		Denmark	
AR year		2014	
Version of the AR reviewed		31 May 2015	
Version of the NP proposal		31 Oct 2011	
		EWG Answer	
Overall compliance		Mostly	
C4	Actions to avoid deviations	Are the deviations justified?	
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	
North Sea and Eastern Artic			
C1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is Table III.C.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	
		Is Table III.C.4 consistent with AR guidelines?	
		Is Table III.C.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	
		Is Table III.C.6 consistent with AR guidelines?	
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	
		Are the deviations explained?	
Are the deviations justified?			
C2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
C4	Actions to avoid deviations	Are the deviations explained?	
		Are the deviations justified?	
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	
North Atlantic			
C1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is Table III.C.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	
		Is Table III.C.4 consistent with AR guidelines?	
		Is Table III.C.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	
		Is Table III.C.6 consistent with AR guidelines?	
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	
		Are the deviations explained?	
		Are the deviations justified?	
C2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
C4	Actions to avoid deviations	Are the deviations explained?	
		Are the deviations justified?	
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	
D			
Recreational fisheries		Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?	
		Is Table III.D.1 consistent with the AR guidelines?	
Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic			
D1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	
		Are the deviations explained?	



Member State:		Denmark	
AR year		2014	
Version of the AR reviewed		31 May 2015	
Version of the NP proposal		31 Oct 2011	
		EWG Answer	
Overall compliance		Mostly	
		EWG Comment	EWG judgement
	Are the deviations justified?	No results are presented, so it's not possible to evaluate what the deviations are, and if they are sufficiently explained and addressed.	Partly
D2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		MS is asked to justify deviations on recreational fisheries sampling of eel, cod and sharks.
	Are the deviations explained?	Cannot fully judge - no information on eel, cod and sharks provided	Partly
	Are the deviations justified?	Cannot fully judge - no information on eel, cod and sharks provided	Partly
D4	Actions to avoid deviations		
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Cannot fully judge - no information on eel, cod and sharks provided	Partly
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Cannot fully judge - no information on eel, cod and sharks provided	Partly
E	Biological stock-related variables		
	Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	No comment	Yes
Region : Baltic			
E1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	In table IIIE1 the sampling year and reference period should be included in the heading.	Yes.
	Is Table III.E.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	no comment	Yes.
	Is Table III.E.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	no comment	Yes.
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	no comment	Yes.
		Some under sampling occurred for parameters associated with Gadus morhua, Sprattus sprattus and Limanda limanda. Data provided for more species than planned in III.E.2 (mainly flatfishes).	mostly
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	no comment	Yes.
	Are the deviations explained?	no comment	Yes.
	Are the deviations justified?		
E2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the deviations explained?	no comment	Yes.
	Are the deviations justified?	no comment	Yes.
E4	Actions to avoid deviations		
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	no comment	Yes.
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	no comment	Yes.
North Sea and Eastern Arctic			
E1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	no comment	Yes.
	Is Table III.E.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	no comment	Yes.
		Some codes "area/stock" not consistent between III.E.2 and III.E.3 (herring for example with 3 lines in III.E.2 and only 2 stocks in III.E.3).	Yes.
	Is Table III.E.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	no comment	Yes.
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	There appears to have been major issues with the targets set in the NP in terms of incorrect numbers being assigned or incorrect parameter targets for various areas. 8 out of 22 stock/biological parameters planned for sampling were under sampled. Generally targets were achieved or exceeded. Weight@length for the 2 stocks of Nephrops missing. Norway pout partly sampled.	Mostly
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	no comment	Yes.
	Are the deviations explained?	no comment	Yes.
	Are the deviations justified?		
E2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the deviations explained?	no comment	Yes.
	Are the deviations justified?	no comment	Yes.
E4	Actions to avoid deviations		
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	no comment	Yes.
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	no comment	Yes.
North Atlantic			
E1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	no comment	Yes.
	Is Table III.E.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	no comment	Yes.
	Is Table III.E.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	no comment	Yes.
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	no comment	Yes.
		Yes, sampling for Capros aper, was unplanned in the original NP but necessary as the fishery emerged in the intervening years.	Yes.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA there are no deviations	NA
	Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA
	Are the deviations justified?		
E2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the deviations explained?	NA there are no deviations	NA
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA
E4	Actions to avoid deviations		
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	NA there are no deviations	NA
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	NA	NA
F Transversal variables			
	Is Table III.F.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes
F1	Capacity		
F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA

Member State:		Denmark					
AR year		2014					
Version of the AR reviewed		31 May 2015					
Version of the NP proposal		31 Oct 2011					
		EWG Answer					
Overall compliance		Mostly					
		EWG Comment	EWG judgement				
		EWG - Action needed?					
F2	F13	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed		
		Actions to avoid deviations					
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed		
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed		
	Effort	F21	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
			Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
			Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
			Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
		F22	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
			Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
			Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
			Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
		F23	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations				
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No action needed	
			Are the responsive actions described ?	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No action needed	
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No action needed	
			F24	Actions to avoid deviations			
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?				Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed	
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA		No action needed			
F3	Landings	F31	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
			Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
			Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed		
	F32	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal					
		Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed		
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed		
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed		
	F33	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations					
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No action needed		
		Are the responsive actions described ?	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No action needed		
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No action needed		
		F34	Actions to avoid deviations				
			Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed	
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?		Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed		
	G	Research surveys at sea					
	G1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is Table III.G.1 consistent with AR guidelines?				
Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?							
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?			some achievement rates <90% due to bad weather	Mostly	No action needed		
Are the deviations explained?			No comments	Yes	No action needed		
Are the deviations justified?			No comments	Yes	No action needed		
Is a map of each survey with achieved sampling activities provided?			No comments	Yes	No action needed		
G2			Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
			Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
			Are the deviations explained?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed	
			Are the deviations justified?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed	
G4			Actions to avoid deviations				
			Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed	
			Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed	
IV			Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry				
A			Collection of data concerning the aquaculture	Is Table IV.A.1 consistent with AR guidelines			
	Is Table IV.A.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments		Yes	No actions needed		
	Is Table IV.A.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments		Yes	No actions needed		
	A1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal					
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?		No comments	Yes	No actions needed	
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		No comments	Yes	No actions needed	
		Are the deviations explained?		No comments	NA	No actions needed	
		Are the deviations justified?		No comments	NA	No actions needed	
	A2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal					
		Is respective data quality information given?		No comments	Yes	No actions needed	
		Are the deviations explained?		No comments	Yes	No actions needed	
		Are the deviations justified?		No comments	Yes	No actions needed	
	A3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations					
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		No comments	NA	No actions needed	
		Are the responsive actions described ?		No comments	NA	No actions needed	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?		No comments	NA	No actions needed	
	A4	Actions to avoid deviations					
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?		No comments	NA	No actions needed	
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?		No comments	NA	No actions needed			
B	Collection of data concerning the processing industry						
		Is Table IV.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed		
		Is Table IV.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed		

Member State:		Denmark	
AR year		2014	
Version of the AR reviewed		31 May 2015	
Version of the NP proposal		31 Oct 2011	
		EWG Answer	
Overall compliance		Mostly	
		EWG Comment	EWG judgement    EWG - Action needed?
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal <i>Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?</i> <i>Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?</i> <i>Are the deviations explained?</i> <i>Are the deviations justified?</i>		
		No comments	Yes No actions needed
		No comments	Yes No actions needed
		No comments	Yes No actions needed
		No comments	Yes No actions needed
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal <i>Is respective data quality information given?</i> <i>Are the deviations explained?</i> <i>Are the deviations justified?</i>		
		No comments	Yes No actions needed
		No comments	Yes No actions needed
		No comments	Yes No actions needed
B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations <i>Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?</i> <i>Are the responsive actions described ?</i> <i>Are the responsive actions acceptable?</i>		
		No comments	NA No actions needed
		No comments	NA No actions needed
		No comments	NA No actions needed
B4	Actions to avoid deviations <i>Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?</i> <i>Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?</i>		
		No comments	NA No actions needed
		No comments	NA No actions needed
V    Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem			
1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal <i>Is Table V.1 consistent with AR guidelines?</i>		No comments	Yes No action needed
2 Actions to avoid deviations <i>Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described?</i> <i>Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?</i>		Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA No action needed
		Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA No action needed
VI    Module for management and use of the data			
1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal  <i>Is Table VI.1 consistent with AR guidelines?</i> <i>Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?</i> <i>Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?</i> <i>Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?</i> <i>Are the deviations explained?</i> <i>Are the deviations justified?</i>		Not all relevant end-users have been listed. No information on data about small pelagics was provided to STECF, but only for Baltic. STECF expert working group should be specified, missing information on data provided under the RCM data calls.	Mostly MS should list RCM data calls and specified the STECF EWG to which data were provided.
2	Actions to avoid deviations <i>Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?</i> <i>Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?</i>	No comments.	Yes No action needed.
		No comments.	Yes No action needed.
		No comments.	Yes No action needed.
		NA	NA No action needed.
		NA	NA No action needed.
		NA	NA No action needed.
		NA	NA No action needed.
VII    Follow-up of STECF recommendati (-> dealt with under II.B.2)			
VIII    List of acronyms and abbreviations <i>Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?</i>			
		Yes	Yes No action needed.
IX    Comments, suggestions and reflections  <i>Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?</i>			
		No comments	No No actions needed
X    References  <i>Is there a complete list of references?</i>			
		No references	No MS should provide references.
XI    Annexes  <i>Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?</i> <i>Are relevant bilateral and/or multilateral agreements included?</i>			
		No annexes	No MS should provide annexes.
		No annexes	No MS should provide multilateral agreements.



Member State:		Estonia			
		AR year	2014		
		Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2015		
		Version of the NP proposal	31 March 2010		
			EWG Answer		
		Overall compliance	Mostly		
			EWG Comment	EWG judgement	EWG - Action needed?
I General framework			Is Table I.A.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes No action needed
			Is Table I.A.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes No action needed
II National data collection organisation					
A National correspondent and participating institutes					
			Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	No comments	Yes No action needed
			Is there a national DCF website available?	No comments	Yes No action needed
			Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?	Presumably (all in Estonian)	NA No action needed
			Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	No comments	Yes For the future MS should provide minutes of the national coordination meetings.
B Regional and International coordination					
B1 Attendance of international meetings					
			Is Table II.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Other relevant meetings (e.g. RCM NS&EA) should be attended.	Yes No action needed
			Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	NA	MS to explain why they haven't participate to the RCM meeting.
B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations and agreements					
			In Table II.B.2, are the relevant regional and international recommendations (RCM's/STECF/LM/Survey Planning Groups) listed?	No comments	Yes No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes No action needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes No action needed
III Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector					
A General description of the fishing sector					
			Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	Changes only very briefly described	Yes MS to follow the guideline and to provide the description of the fisheries in the fishing sectors.
B Economic variables			Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?	Not applicable. Only one supra-region	NA No action needed
SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea, Eastern Arctic, North Atlantic					
			Is Table III.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes No actions needed.
			Is Table III.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	The codes for the data submission should not be used to name the segments. The segments should be named according to the Comm. Dec. 2010/93/EU Appendix III.	Yes Follow the guidance next year.
			Is Table III.B.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	Response rate is not provided (in case of type of data collection 'B'- sampling survey, both quality indicators, achieved sample rate and response rate should be provided.)	Mostly Achieved sample rate and Response rate should be provided. MS has to resubmit the standard table III.B.3.
B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal					
			Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes No actions needed
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes No actions needed
			Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes No actions needed
			Are the deviations justified?	Justification is based on the need to increase the level of responses. However, the response rate for the segment pelagic trawlers 24-40 is still low (38% with a census). Actions to increase the response rate are not clear.	Yes MS has to define the actions needed in the future to increase response rate in case of census.
B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal					
			Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes No actions needed
			Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes No actions needed
			Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes No actions needed
B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations					
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA No actions needed
			Are the responsive actions described?	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA No actions needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA No actions needed
B4 Actions to avoid deviations					
			Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	Yes No actions needed
			Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes No actions needed
C Biological metier related variables					
			Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	Data are not presented using correct region definitions. There are also inconsistencies between the text and the different tables.	No MS should split data into the correct regions according to the guidelines and resubmit text and all tables.
Baltic					
C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal					
			Is Table III.C.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes No action needed
			Is Table III.C.4 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes No action needed
			Is Table III.C.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	FYK_FWS_0_0 is a combination of commercial sampling and test fishing. It would be preferable if MS was able to split the data on each category.	Yes MS must resubmit the table revised according to the guidelines, separating data by category.
			Is Table III.C.6 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes No action needed

<b>Member State:</b>	<b>Estonia</b>
<b>AR year</b>	<b>2014</b>
<b>Version of the AR reviewed</b>	31 May 2015
<b>Version of the NP proposal</b>	31 March 2010
	<b>EWG Answer</b>
<b>Overall compliance</b>	<b>Mostly</b>

		<b>EWG Comment</b>	<b>EWG judgement</b>	<b>EWG - Action needed?</b>
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	Additional test fishing in salmon and trout rivers and smolt trapping are also reported in Table III.C.3 in the AR which was not planned in the NP. The test fishing surveys are included in two metiers (GNS_FWS_0_0 and FYK_FWS_0_0). Test fishing cannot be considered as substitute for sampling of selected commercial metiers eventhough they are included in the NP.	Mostly	No action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	The test fishing surveys have been used to reach targets for GNS_FWS_0_0 and FYK_FWS_0_0. Especially for FYK_FWS_0_0 it is not possible to trace the origin of data. Test fishing cannot be considered as substitute for sampling of selected commercial metiers eventhough they are included in the NP.	Partly	Next year and onwards, MS should look into their sampling scheme. Also, MS should present commercial data and survey data separately.
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<b>C2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Are the deviations explained?	Information is not sufficient provided to allow a proper evaluation.	Mostly	Next year and onwards, MS should present comprehensive information for the issue.
	Are the deviations justified?	Information is not sufficient provided to allow a proper evaluation.	Mostly	Next year and onwards, MS should present comprehensive information for the issue.
<b>C4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid deviations</b>			
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed

North sea and Eastern Atlantic

<b>C1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Is Table III.C.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Data are not presented using correct region definitions. There are inconsistencies between "Region", "Fishing ground" and "RMFO/RFO/IO". There are also inconsistencies between the text and the different tables.	Partly	MS should correct and resubmit text and table.
	Is Table III.C.4 consistent with AR guidelines?	Data are not presented using correct region definitions. There are inconsistencies between "Region" and "RMFO/RFO/IO". There are also inconsistencies between the text and the different tables.	Partly	MS should correct and resubmit text and table.
	Is Table III.C.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	Data are not presented using correct region definitions. There are inconsistencies between "Region", "Fishing ground" and "RMFO/RFO/IO". There are also inconsistencies between the text and the different tables.	Partly	MS should correct and resubmit text and table.
	Is Table III.C.6 consistent with AR guidelines?	Data are not presented using correct region definitions. There are inconsistencies between "Region", "Fishing ground" and "RMFO/RFO/IO". There are also inconsistencies between the text and the different tables.	Partly	MS should correct and resubmit text and table.
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	Data are not presented using correct region definitions. There are inconsistencies between the text and the different tables. Therefore, it is impossible to evaluate strictly.	NA	MS should correct and resubmit text and relevant tables.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Data are not presented using correct region definitions. There are also inconsistencies between the text and the different tables. Therefore, it is impossible to evaluate strictly.	NA	MS should correct and resubmit text and relevant tables.
	Are the deviations explained?	Data are not presented using correct region definitions. There are also inconsistencies between the text and the different tables. Therefore, it is impossible to evaluate strictly.	NA	MS should correct and resubmit text and relevant tables.
	Are the deviations justified?	Data are not presented using correct region definitions. There are also inconsistencies between the text and the different tables. Therefore, it is impossible to evaluate strictly.	NA	MS should correct and resubmit text and relevant tables.
<b>C2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Are the deviations explained?	Data are not presented using correct region definitions. There are also inconsistencies between the text and the different tables. Therefore, it is impossible to evaluate strictly.	NA	MS should correct and resubmit text and relevant tables.
	Are the deviations justified?	Data are not presented using correct region definitions. There are also inconsistencies between the text and the different tables. Therefore, it is impossible to evaluate strictly.	NA	MS should correct and resubmit text and relevant tables.
<b>C4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid deviations</b>			
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Due to the faulty region definitions, it is not possible to evaluate the information provided.	Partly	MS should correct and resubmit text and relevant tables.
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Due to the faulty region definitions, it is not possible to evaluate the information provided.	Partly	MS should correct and resubmit text and relevant tables.

North Atlantic

<b>C1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
-----------	---	--	--	--

<b>Member State:</b>	<b>Estonia</b>
<b>AR year</b>	<b>2014</b>
<b>Version of the AR reviewed</b>	31 May 2015
<b>Version of the NP proposal</b>	31 March 2010
	<b>EWG Answer</b>
<b>Overall compliance</b>	<b>Mostly</b>

		EWG Comment	EWG judgement	EWG - Action needed?
	Is Table III.C.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Data are not presented using correct region definitions. There are inconsistencies between "Region", "Fishing ground" and "RMFO/RFO/IO". There are also inconsistencies between the text and the different tables.	Partly	MS should correct and resubmit text and table.
	Is Table III.C.4 consistent with AR guidelines?	Data are not presented using correct region definitions. There are inconsistencies between "Region" and "RMFO/RFO/IO". There are also inconsistencies between the text and the different tables.	Partly	MS should correct and resubmit text and table.
	Is Table III.C.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	Data are not presented using correct region definitions. There are inconsistencies between "Region", "Fishing ground" and "RMFO/RFO/IO". There are also inconsistencies between the text and the different tables.	Partly	MS should correct and resubmit text and table.
	Is Table III.C.6 consistent with AR guidelines?	Data are not presented using correct region definitions. There are inconsistencies between "Region", "Fishing ground" and "RMFO/RFO/IO". There are also inconsistencies between the text and the different tables.	Partly	MS should correct and resubmit text and table.
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	Data are not presented using correct region definitions. There are also inconsistencies between the text and the different tables. Therefore, it is impossible to evaluate strictly.	NA	MS should correct and resubmit text and relevant tables.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Data are not presented using correct region definitions. There are also inconsistencies between the text and the different tables. Therefore, it is impossible to evaluate strictly.	NA	MS should correct and resubmit text and relevant tables.
	Are the deviations explained?	Data are not presented using correct region definitions. There are also inconsistencies between the text and the different tables. Therefore, it is impossible to evaluate strictly.	NA	MS should correct and resubmit text and relevant tables.
	Are the deviations justified?	Data are not presented using correct region definitions. There are also inconsistencies between the text and the different tables. Therefore, it is impossible to evaluate strictly.	NA	MS should correct and resubmit text and relevant tables.
<b>C2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Are the deviations explained?	Data are not presented using correct region definitions. There are also inconsistencies between the text and the different tables. Therefore, it is impossible to evaluate strictly.	NA	MS should correct and resubmit text and relevant tables.
	Are the deviations justified?	Data are not presented using correct region definitions. There are also inconsistencies between the text and the different tables. Therefore, it is impossible to evaluate strictly.	NA	MS should correct and resubmit text and relevant tables.
<b>C4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid deviations</b>			
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	The information is sufficient, but should be structured under the right region in the updated text.	Mostly	MS should update relevant section in the text.
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	The information is sufficient, but should be structured under the right region in the updated text.	Mostly	MS should update relevant section in the text.
<b>D</b>	<b>Recreational fisheries</b>			
	Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table III.D.1 consistent with the AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<b>Baltic</b>				
<b>D1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed
<b>D2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Are the deviations explained?	Information on quality of data provided but no quality targets were specified in the NP	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
<b>D4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid deviations</b>			
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed
<b>E</b>	<b>Biological stock-related variables</b>			
	Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<b>Baltic</b>				
<b>E1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Is Table III.E.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table III.E.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table III.E.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	24 of the 58 planned species/parameters are under sampled, some significantly so.	Partly	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed



<b>Member State:</b>	<b>Estonia</b>
<b>AR year</b>	<b>2014</b>
<b>Version of the AR reviewed</b>	31 May 2015
<b>Version of the NP proposal</b>	31 March 2010
	<b>EWG Answer</b>
<b>Overall compliance</b>	<b>Mostly</b>

		<b>EWG Comment</b>	<b>EWG judgement</b>	<b>EWG - Action needed?</b>
	<a href="#">Are the deviations justified?</a>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<b>E2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	<a href="#">Are the deviations explained?</a>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	<a href="#">Are the deviations justified?</a>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<b>E4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid deviations</b>			
	<a href="#">Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?</a>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	<a href="#">Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?</a>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<b>North Sea and Eastern Arctic</b>				
<b>E1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	<a href="#">Is Table III.E.1 consistent with AR guidelines?</a>	Data are not presented using correct region definitions. There are inconsistencies between "Region", "Fishing ground" and "RMFO/RFO/IO". There are also inconsistencies between the text and the different tables.	Partly	MS should correct and resubmit text and table.
	<a href="#">Is Table III.E.2 consistent with AR guidelines?</a>	Data are not presented using correct region definitions. There are inconsistencies between "Region", "Fishing ground" and "RMFO/RFO/IO". There are also inconsistencies between the text and the different tables.	Partly	MS should correct and resubmit text and table.
	<a href="#">Is Table III.E.3 consistent with AR guidelines?</a>	Data are not presented using correct region definitions. There are inconsistencies between "Region", "Fishing ground" and "RMFO/RFO/IO". There are also inconsistencies between the text and the different tables.	Partly	MS should correct and resubmit text and table.
	<a href="#">Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?</a>	Data are not presented using correct region definitions. There are also inconsistencies between the text and the different tables. Therefore, it is impossible to evaluate strictly.	NA	MS should correct and resubmit text and relevant tables.
	<a href="#">Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?</a>	Data are not presented using correct region definitions. There are also inconsistencies between the text and the different tables. Therefore, it is impossible to evaluate strictly.	NA	MS should correct and resubmit text and relevant tables.
	<a href="#">Are the deviations explained?</a>	Data are not presented using correct region definitions. There are also inconsistencies between the text and the different tables. Therefore, it is impossible to evaluate strictly.	NA	MS should correct and resubmit text and relevant tables.
	<a href="#">Are the deviations justified?</a>	Data are not presented using correct region definitions. There are also inconsistencies between the text and the different tables. Therefore, it is impossible to evaluate strictly.	NA	MS should correct and resubmit text and relevant tables.
<b>E2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	<a href="#">Are the deviations explained?</a>	Data are not presented using correct region definitions. There are also inconsistencies between the text and the different tables. Therefore, it is impossible to evaluate strictly.	NA	MS should correct and resubmit text and relevant tables.
	<a href="#">Are the deviations justified?</a>	Data are not presented using correct region definitions. There are also inconsistencies between the text and the different tables. Therefore, it is impossible to evaluate strictly.	NA	MS should correct and resubmit text and relevant tables.
<b>E4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid deviations</b>			
	<a href="#">Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?</a>	The information is sufficient, but should be structured under the right region in the updated text.	Mostly	MS should update relevant section in the text.
	<a href="#">Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?</a>	The information is sufficient, but should be structured under the right region in the updated text.	Mostly	MS should update relevant section in the text.
<b>F</b>	<b>Transversal variables</b>			
	<a href="#">Is Table III.F.1 consistent with AR guidelines?</a>	MS indicates that effort data on vessels <12m have been collected, but have not been transferred into an electronic form. MS referred to 2013 altogether.	Yes	MS should be able to provide collected data by 2016. MS should provide data for the same reference year as AR in case when administrative data sources are used (e.g. logbooks, Fleet Register, sales notes etc.)
<b>F1</b>	<b>Capacity</b>			
<b>F11</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	<a href="#">Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?</a>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	<a href="#">Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?</a>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	<a href="#">Are the deviations explained?</a>	No comments	NA	No action needed
	<a href="#">Are the deviations justified?</a>	No comments	NA	No action needed
<b>F13</b>	<b>Actions to avoid deviations</b>			
	<a href="#">Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?</a>	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed
	<a href="#">Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?</a>	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed
<b>F2</b>	<b>Effort</b>			
<b>F21</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	<a href="#">Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?</a>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	<a href="#">Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?</a>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	<a href="#">Are the deviations explained?</a>	No comments	NA	No action needed
	<a href="#">Are the deviations justified?</a>	MS indicates that effort data on vessels <12m have been collected, but have not been transferred into an electronic form.	Yes	MS should be able to provide collected data by 2016.
<b>F22</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			

<b>Member State:</b>	<b>Estonia</b>
<b>AR year</b>	<b>2014</b>
<b>Version of the AR reviewed</b>	31 May 2015
<b>Version of the NP proposal</b>	31 March 2010
<b>Overall compliance</b>	<b>EWG Answer</b> <b>Mostly</b>

EWG Comment	EWG judgement	EWG - Action needed?
Data quality for coastal fleets missing.	Mostly	MS should be able to provide related quality data by 2016.
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No action needed
Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No action needed
Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	MS should be able to provide collected data by 2016.
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No action needed
Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No action needed
Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No action needed
Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed
Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed
Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed
<b>industry</b>		
No comments	Yes	No actions needed
The Frame population for the Rainbow trout is segment is higher than Target population.	Yes	The total population should be clarified.
No comments	Yes	No actions needed
No comments	Yes	No actions needed
No comments	Yes	No actions needed
No comments	NA	No actions needed
No comments	NA	No actions needed
No comments	Yes	No actions needed
No comments	NA	No actions needed
No comments	NA	No actions needed
Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No actions needed
Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No actions needed
Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No actions needed
Reference to the low achived sample rate.	Yes	No actions needed

Member State:		Estonia				
		AR year	2014			
		Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2015			
		Version of the NP proposal	31 March 2010			
			EWG Answer			
		Overall compliance	Mostly			
			EWG Comment	EWG judgement	EWG - Action needed?	
B	Collection of data concerning the processing industry	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	Mostly	No actions needed	
		Is Table IV.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed	
		Is Table IV.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed	
	B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed	
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed	
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed	
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed	
	B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
		Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed	
Are the deviations explained?		No comments	Yes	No actions needed		
B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations					
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No actions needed		
	Are the responsive actions described ?	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No actions needed		
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No actions needed		
	B4	Actions to avoid deviations				
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	NA	No actions needed	
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No actions needed		
	V Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem					
	1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal					
		Is Table V.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
2 Actions to avoid deviations						
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed		
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed		
VI Module for management and use of the data						
1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal						
	Is Table VI.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	The table is not fully complete. Missing information for data transmission to end users (e.g. RCM NS&A, STECF JRC Processing, JRC Fleet Economic, ICES WGWIDE, etc...)	Partly	MS to list all the end users for which MS transmitted data.		
	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Mostly	MS to list all the end users for which MS transmitted data.		
	Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed		
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed		
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed		
2 Actions to avoid deviations						
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed		
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed		
VII Follow-up of STECF recommendations (-> dealt with under II.B.2)						
VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations						
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed		
IX Comments, suggestions and reflections						
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed		
X References						
	Is there a complete list of references?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed		
XI Annexes						
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed		
	Are relevant bilateral and/or multilateral agreements included?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed		



Member State:		Finland			
AR year			2014		
Version of the AR reviewed			29 May 2015		
Version of the NP proposal			3 April 2013		
			EWG Answer		
Overall compliance			Yes		
Pre-screening comments					
			EWG Comment	EWG judgement	EWG - Action needed?
			No comments	Yes	No action needed
			No comments	Yes	No action needed
I	General framework				
		Is Table I.A.1 consistent with AR guidelines?			
		Is Table I.A.2 consistent with AR guidelines?			
II	National data collection organisation				
A	National correspondent and participating institutes				
		Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?			
		Is there a national DCF website available?			
		Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?			
		Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?			
B	Regional and International coordination				
B1	Attendance of international meetings				
		Is Table II.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?			
		Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?			
B2	Follow-up of regional and international recommendations and agreements				
		In Table II.B.2, are the relevant regional and international recommendations (RCM's/STECF/LM/Survey Planning Groups) listed?			
		Are the responsive actions described?			
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?			
III	Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector				
A	General description of the fishing sector				
		Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?			
B	Economic variables				
		Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?			
		SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea, Eastern Arctic, North Atlantic			
		Is Table III.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?			
		Is Table III.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?			
		Is Table III.B.3 consistent with AR guidelines?			
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?			
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?			
		Are the deviations explained?			
		Are the deviations justified?			
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
		Is respective data quality information given?			
		Are the deviations explained?			
		Are the deviations justified?			
B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations				
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?			
		Are the responsive actions described?			
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?			
B4	Actions to avoid deviations				
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?			
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?			
C	Biological metier related variables				
		Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?			
		Baltic			
C1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
		Is Table III.C.1 consistent with AR guidelines?			
		Is Table III.C.4 consistent with AR guidelines?			
		Is Table III.C.3 consistent with AR guidelines?			
		Is Table III.C.6 consistent with AR guidelines?			
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?			
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?			
		Are the deviations explained?			
		Are the deviations justified?			
C2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
		Are the deviations explained?			
		Are the deviations justified?			
C4	Actions to avoid deviations				
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?			
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?			
D	Recreational fisheries				
		Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?			
		Is Table III.D.1 consistent with the AR guidelines?			
		Baltic			
D1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?			
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?			
		Are the deviations explained?			
		Are the deviations justified?			
D2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
		Are the deviations explained?			
		Are the deviations justified?			
D4	Actions to avoid deviations				
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?			
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?			
E	Biological stock-related variables				
		Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?			
		Baltic			



Member State:		Finland			
		AR year	2014		
		Version of the AR reviewed	29 May 2015		
		Version of the NP proposal	3 April 2013		
			EWG Answer		
		Overall compliance	Yes		
Pre-screening comments					
			EWG Comment	EWG judgement	EWG - Action needed?
A1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is Table IV.A.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No actions needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No actions needed
A2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No actions needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No actions needed
A3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	NA	No actions needed
		Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA	No actions needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No actions needed
A4	Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	NA	No actions needed
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No actions needed
B	Collection of data concerning the processing industry	Is Table IV.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed
		Is Table IV.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No actions needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No actions needed
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No actions needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No actions needed
B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	NA	No actions needed
		Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA	No actions needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No actions needed
B4	Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	NA	No actions needed
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No actions needed
V Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem					
1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is Table V.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
2	Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed
VI Module for management and use of the data					
1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is Table VI.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
2	Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	NA	NA	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
VII Follow-up of STECF recommendations (-> dealt with under II.B.2)					
VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations					
IX	Comments, suggestions and reflections	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed
		Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	No comments	NA	No actions needed
X References					
XI	Annexes	Is there a complete list of references?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed
		Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed
		Are relevant bilateral and/or multilateral agreements included?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed



<b>Member State:</b>		<b>France</b>			
AR year			<b>2014</b>		
Version of the AR reviewed			31 May 2015		
Version of the NP proposal			Version 7 of 3 Sep 2012		
			<b>EWG Answer</b>		
Overall compliance			<b>Partly</b>		
			<b>EWG Comment</b>	<b>EWG judgement</b>	<b>EWG - Action needed?</b>
<b>I General framework</b>			No comments	Yes	No action needed
Is Table I.A.1 consistent with AR guidelines?			Table not filled by MS	No	MS to fill the table
<b>II National data collection organisation</b>					
<b>A National correspondent and participating institutes</b>			No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?			No website link provided	Yes	MS to provide the website link
Is there a national DCF website available?			No website link provided	NA	MS to provide information about the existence of the website. Otherwise, MS shall implement a DCF website until the end of current year.
Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?			No comments	Yes	For the future MS should provide minutes of the national coordination meetings.
<b>B Regional and International coordination</b>					
<b>B1 Attendance of international meetings</b>			No comments	Yes	No action needed
Is Table II.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?			NA	NA	No action needed
Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?					
<b>B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations and agreements</b>			No comments	Yes	No action needed
In Table II.B.2, are the relevant regional and international recommendations (RCM's/STECF/LM/Survey Planning Groups) listed?			No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the responsive actions described?			No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the responsive actions acceptable?			No comments	Yes	No action needed
<b>III Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector</b>					
<b>A General description of the fishing sector</b>			No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?			If the same methodology is applied in all supraregions then insert one common text for all supra-regions under a heading that states "All Supra-Regions"	Yes	In the future MS has to specify if the text refers to "all supra-regions"
<b>B Economic variables</b>					
Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?			No comments	Yes	No action needed
<b>SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea, Eastern Arctic, North Atlantic</b>			No comments	Yes	No action needed
Is Table III.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?			Achieved sample rates, response rates, data sources and type of data collection schemes are missing for several segments/variables	Partly	MS is requested to resubmit the table.
Is Table III.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?					
Is Table III.B.3 consistent with AR guidelines?			No comments	Yes	No action needed
<b>B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			No comments	Yes	No action needed
Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?			No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?			No comments	NA	No action needed
Are the deviations explained?			No comments	NA	No action needed
Are the deviations justified?					
<b>B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			No comments	Yes	No action needed
Is respective data quality information given?			No comments	NA	No action needed
Are the deviations explained?			No comments	NA	No action needed
Are the deviations justified?					
<b>B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			No comments	NA	No action needed
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?			No comments	NA	No action needed
Are the responsive actions described?			No comments	NA	No action needed
Are the responsive actions acceptable?					
<b>B4 Actions to avoid deviations</b>			Yes	yes	No action needed
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?			Yes	yes	No action needed
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?					
<b>SUPRA-REGION Mediterranean and Black Sea</b>			No comments	Yes	No action needed
Is Table III.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?			No comments	Yes	No action needed
Is Table III.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?			Achieved sample rates, response rates, data sources and type of data collection schemes are missing for several segments/variables	Partly	MS is requested to resubmit the table.
Is Table III.B.3 consistent with AR guidelines?					
<b>B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			No comments	Yes	No action needed
Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?			No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?			No comments	NA	No action needed
Are the deviations explained?			No comments	NA	No action needed
Are the deviations justified?					
<b>B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			No comments	Yes	No action needed
Is respective data quality information given?			No comments	NA	No action needed
Are the deviations explained?			No comments	NA	No action needed
Are the deviations justified?					
<b>B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			No comments	NA	No action needed
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?			No comments	NA	No action needed
Are the responsive actions described?			No comments	NA	No action needed
Are the responsive actions acceptable?					
<b>B4 Actions to avoid deviations</b>			Yes	yes	No action needed
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?			Yes	yes	No action needed
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?					
<b>SUPRA-REGION Other Fishing Regions</b>					
Is Table III.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?			Complete information is provided only for 2 segments. For the other 19 segments only target population is provided	Partly	MS is requested to resubmit the table.
Is Table III.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?			No comments	Yes	No action needed
Is Table III.B.3 consistent with AR guidelines?			Achieved sample rates, response rates, data sources and type of data collection schemes are missing for several segments/variables	Partly	MS is requested to resubmit the table.

Member State:		France	
AR year		2014	
Version of the AR reviewed		31 May 2015	
Version of the NP proposal		Version 7 of 3 Sep 2012	
		EWG Answer	
Overall compliance		Partly	
		EWG Comment	EWG judgementEWG - Action needed?
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	Sampling scheme only covers two segments. No derogations exist for not collecting data in other regions	PartlyMS is requested to take actions to collect complete data for vessels operating in other regions
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Sampling scheme only covers two segments. In the text it is reported that: "Economic data could not be provided for other fleet segments and other regions because of the lack of resources and methodological difficulties"	PartlyMS is requested to take actions to collect complete data for vessels operating in other regions
	Are the deviations explained?	Only very partial information is given.	PartlyDeviations from the NP has to be explained in the AR
	Are the deviations justified?	Lack of resources and methodological difficulties cannot be considered proper justification for not collecting data	NoDeviations from the NP has to be justified in the AR
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is respective data quality information given?	Only very partial information is given.	PartlyMS has to provide qualitative description regarding the assessment of quality of data collected
	Are the deviations explained?	No explanation is given on deviations in the achieved accuracy compared to what was planned in the NP proposal	NoMS has to explain the deviations
	Are the deviations justified?	No explanations is given on the reasons for the deviations	NoMS has to justify the deviations
B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NANo action needed
	Are the responsive actions described?	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NANo action needed
B4	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NANo action needed
	Actions to avoid deviations		
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Partly	PartlyMS has to inform on actions that will be taken in the future to improve the data collection in other regions
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Partly	PartlyMS has to inform on actions that will be taken in the future to improve the data collection in other regions
C	Biological metier related variables		
	Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	MS should strictly follow the agreed naming convention for the Region (e.g. long distance fishery is not a Region, and the correct name of the Mediterranean is "Mediterraneanand Black Sea")	MostlyNext year and onwards MS should follow the region naming convention.
Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic			
C1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	The reference period used in table III.C.1 for the métiers is 2007-2008. In the current Guidelines for the AR2014, there is referred to that the reference period for the métiers should be the previous two years. MS need to adjust the reference period in Table III.C.1 (colom B). MS need to review the whole table, based on the correct reference period.	PartlyMS is requested to resubmit the table with an updated ranking according to the guidelines (reference period 2012-2013). MS is also requested to update the text accordingly when necessary.
	Is Table III.C.4 consistent with AR guidelines?	According to the Guidelines AR2014 , sampling frame codes used in table III.C.4 should match the sampling frame codes in Table.III.C.3. This not always the case and not always consistent. Some métiers referred to in the Table III.C.4 (Sampling Strategy) are not mentioned in the Table III.C.3. Ex: OTB_DEF_100-119_0_0 is not in table III.C.4, but is sampled. Column P (Planned total no. trips to be sampled by MS (N+O)) should fully match with the total number of trips.	PartlyMS is requested to resubmit the complete set of III.C tables. MS is also requested to update the text accordingly when necessary.
	Is Table III.C.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	According to the Guidelines AR2014 , sampling frame codes used in table III.C.3 should match the sampling frame codes in Table.III.C.4. This not always the case and not always consistent.	PartlyMS is requested to resubmit the complete set of III.C tables. MS is also requested to update the text accordingly when necessary.
	Is Table III.C.6 consistent with AR guidelines?	For "Metier level 6" "Unspecified" is not a valid parameter. "Species group" should be completed fo all species.	MostlyMS is requested to resubmit the complete set of III.C tables. MS is also requested to update the text accordingly when necessary.
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	YesNo action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	There's only a mismatch between planned and achieved sampled on shore (56% achieved), to bypass this problem MS has increased sampling at sea (281% achieved).	YesNo action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	YesNo action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	YesNo action needed
C2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	YesNo action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	YesNo action needed
C4	Actions to avoid deviations		
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	YesNo action needed
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	YesNo action needed
Region North Atlantic			
C1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		



**Member State:**

France	
AR year	2014
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2015
Version of the NP proposal	Version 7 of 3 Sep 2012
	EWG Answer
Overall compliance	Partly

	EWG Comment	EWG judgement EWG - Action needed?	
Is Table III.C.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	The reference period used in table III.C.1 for the métiers is 2007-2008. In the current Guidelines for the AR2014, there is referred to that the reference period for the métiers should be the previous two years. MS need to adjust the reference period in Table III.C.1 (colom B). MS need to review the whole table, based on the correct reference period.	Partly	MS is requested to resubmit the table with an updated ranking according to the guidelines (reference period 2012-2013). MS is also requested to update the text accordingly when necessary.
Is Table III.C.4 consistent with AR guidelines?	According to the Guidelines AR2014 , sampling frame codes used in table III.C.4 should match the sampling frame codes in Table.III.C.3. This not always the case and not always consistent. Some métiers referred to in the Table III.C.4 (Sampling Strategy) are not mentioned in the Table III.C.3. Column P (Planned total no. trips to be sampled by MS (N+O)) should fully match with the total number of trips.	Partly	MS is requested to resubmit the complete set of III.C tables. MS is also requested to update the text accordingly when necessary.
Is Table III.C.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	According to the Guidelines AR2014 , sampling frame codes used in table III.C.3 should match the sampling frame codes in Table.III.C.4. This not always the case and not always consistent.	Partly	MS is requested to resubmit the complete set of III.C tables. MS is also requested to update the text accordingly when necessary.
Is Table III.C.6 consistent with AR guidelines?	For "Metier level 6" "Unspecified" is not a valid parameter. "Species group" should be completed fo all species.	Mostly	MS is requested to resubmit the complete set of III.C tables. MS is also requested to update the text accordingly when necessary.
Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	Few problems encountered with only 5 selected metiers.	Yes	No action needed
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<b>Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<b>Future actions</b>			
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed

## Region Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea

C1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	MS is requested to resubmit the table with an updated ranking according to the guidelines (reference period 2012-2013). MS is also requested to update the text accordingly when necessary.
	Is Table III.C.4 consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	MS is requested to resubmit the complete set of III.C tables. MS is also requested to update the text accordingly when necessary.
	Is Table III.C.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	MS is requested to resubmit the complete set of III.C tables. MS is also requested to update the text accordingly when necessary.
	Is Table III.C.6 consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	MS is requested to resubmit the complete set of III.C tables. MS is also requested to update the text accordingly when necessary.
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	No action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	No action needed
	C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
C4	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	No action needed
	Actions to avoid deviations		
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Yes	No action needed
C4	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Yes	No action needed

## Other regions

### C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Member State:	France
AR year	2014
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2015
Version of the NP proposal	Version 7 of 3 Sep 2012
	EWG Answer
Overall compliance	Partly

		EWG Comment	EWG judgement	EWG - Action needed?
D	C2	Is Table III.C.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	MS is requested to resubmit the table with an updated ranking according to the guidelines (reference period 2012-2013). MS is also requested to update the text accordingly when necessary.
		Is Table III.C.4 consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	MS is requested to resubmit the III.C.4 table. MS is also requested to update the text accordingly when necessary.
		Is Table III.C.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	MS is requested to resubmit the III.C.3 table. MS is also requested to update the text accordingly when necessary.
		Is Table III.C.6 consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	No action needed
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	No action needed
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	No action needed
D	C4	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Yes	No action needed
		Information in the AR text is given for all regions together. According to the Guidelines 2014, MS should insert the difeferent region headers and subsequently have sections with a description by region. Also, there is referred to 'Inland Waters', this not a region. Should be specified under what region this is valid.	Partly	MS is asked to provide text by region and re-submit module
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Cannot judge- no information provided	NA	MS is asked to provide text by region and re-submit module
		Cannot judge- no information provided	NA	MS is asked to provide text by region and re-submit module
		Cannot judge- no information provided	NA	MS is asked to provide text by region and re-submit module
		Cannot judge- no information provided	Partly	MS is asked to provide text by region and re-submit module
		Cannot judge- no information provided	NA	MS is asked to provide text by region and re-submit module
Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic	D1	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	No action needed
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	MS is asked to provide text by region and re-submit module
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	MS is asked to provide text by region and re-submit module
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	MS is asked to provide text by region and re-submit module
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	MS is asked to provide text by region and re-submit module
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	MS is asked to provide text by region and re-submit module
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Partly	MS is asked to provide text by region and re-submit module
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	NA	MS is asked to provide text by region and re-submit module
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	MS is asked to provide text by region and re-submit module
		Are the deviations explained?	Partly	MS is asked to provide text by region and re-submit module
Region North Atlantic	D1	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	No action needed
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	MS is asked to provide text on eel in inland waters and on 2014 data for seabass
		Are the deviations explained?	Partly	MS is asked to provide text by region and re-submit module
		Are the deviations justified?	Partly	MS is asked to provide text by region and re-submit module
		Are the deviations explained?	Partly	MS is asked to provide text by region and re-submit module
		Are the deviations justified?	Partly	MS is asked to provide text by region and re-submit module
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Partly	MS is asked to provide text by region and re-submit module
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	NA	MS is asked to provide text by region and re-submit module
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	MS is asked to provide text on eel in inland waters and on 2014 data for seabass
		Are the deviations explained?	Partly	MS is asked to provide text by region and re-submit module
Region North Atlantic	D2	Are the deviations explained?	NA	MS is asked to provide information on data quality in the AR text
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	MS is asked to provide information on data quality in the AR text
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	MS is asked to provide information on data quality in the AR text
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	MS is asked to provide information on data quality in the AR text
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	MS is asked to provide information on data quality in the AR text
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	MS is asked to provide information on data quality in the AR text
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	MS is asked to provide information on data quality in the AR text
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	MS is asked to provide information on data quality in the AR text
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	MS is asked to provide information on data quality in the AR text
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	MS is asked to provide information on data quality in the AR text
Region North Atlantic	D4	Are the deviations explained?	NA	MS is asked to provide information on data quality in the AR text
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	MS is asked to provide information on data quality in the AR text
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	MS is asked to provide information on data quality in the AR text
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	MS is asked to provide information on data quality in the AR text
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	MS is asked to provide information on data quality in the AR text
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	MS is asked to provide information on data quality in the AR text
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	MS is asked to provide information on data quality in the AR text
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	MS is asked to provide information on data quality in the AR text
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	MS is asked to provide information on data quality in the AR text
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	MS is asked to provide information on data quality in the AR text

Member State:	France		
	AR year	2014	
	Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2015	
	Version of the NP proposal	Version 7 of 3 Sep 2012	
		EWG Answer	
	Overall compliance	Partly	
		EWG Comment	EWG judgementEWG - Action needed?
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Cannot judge- no information provided	NA MS is asked to provide text by region and re-submit module
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Cannot judge- no information provided	NA MS is asked to provide text by region and re-submit module
Region Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea			
D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes No action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	Cannot judge- no information provided	NA MS is asked to provide text by region and re-submit module
	Are the deviations justified?	Cannot judge- no information provided	NA MS is asked to provide text by region and re-submit module
D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Are the deviations explained?	Cannot judge- no information provided	NA MS is asked to provide text by region and re-submit module
	Are the deviations justified?	Cannot judge- no information provided	NA MS is asked to provide text by region and re-submit module
D4 Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Cannot judge- no information provided	NA MS is asked to provide text by region and re-submit module
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Cannot judge- no information provided	NA MS is asked to provide text by region and re-submit module
E Biological stock-related variables	Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	Information is given for all regions. General comment, note that in table III.E.1 the sampling year and the reference period should be included in the headings.	Mostly MS is requested to resubmit table III.E.1 where sampling year and reference year is included.
Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic			
E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is Table III.E.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	MS needs to look into all three tables in III.E (III.E.1, III.E.2 and III.E.3) and revise in order to assure that all selected species are consistently presented. ex: Micromesistius poutassou (North Sea & Eastern Artic).	Mostly MS is requested to resubmit the complete set of III.E tables. MS is also requested to update the text accordingly when necessary.
	Is Table III.E.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	MS needs to look into all three tables in III.E (III.E.1, III.E.2 and III.E.3) and revise in order to assure that all selected species are consistently presented. ex: Micromesistius poutassou (North Sea & Eastern Artic).	Mostly MS is requested to resubmit the complete set of III.E tables. MS is also requested to update the text accordingly when necessary.
	Is Table III.E.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	MS needs to look into all three tables in III.E (III.E.1, III.E.2 and III.E.3) and revise in order to assure that all selected species are consistently presented. ex: Micromesistius poutassou (North Sea & Eastern Artic).	Mostly MS is requested to resubmit the complete set of III.E tables. MS is also requested to update the text accordingly when necessary.
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	Since the tables are not consistent it is difficult to evaluate the sampling scheme.	Mostly No action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Since the tables are not consistent it is difficult to evaluate the achievements compared to the planned sampling levels.	Mostly No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	MS should in the future provide more detailed information instead of general statements.	Mostly No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	MS should in the future provide more detailed information instead of general statements.	Mostly No action needed
E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Are the deviations explained?	Data quality issues are handled elsewhere in the report.	Mostly No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	Data quality issues are handled elsewhere in the report.	Mostly No action needed
E4 Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	MS should in the future provide more detailed information instead of general statements.	Mostly No action needed
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	MS should in the future provide more detailed information instead of general statements.	Mostly No action needed
Region North Atlantic			
E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is Table III.E.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	MS should check the consistency between table III.E.1 and table III.E.2, since in table III.E.2 there are some additional species presented. MS lists NAFO area as a region and this should be changed to North Atlantic.	Mostly MS is requested to resubmit table III.E.1 (and/or table III.E.2.)
	Is Table III.E.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	MS should check the consistency between table III.E.1 and table III.E.2, since in table III.E.2 there are some additional species presented.	Mostly Any action depending on the consistency with table III.E.1.
	Is Table III.E.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	Since the tables are not consistent it is difficult to evaluate the sampling scheme.	Mostly No action needed
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	Since the tables are not consistent it is difficult to evaluate the achievements compared to the planned sampling levels.	Mostly No action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Some under-sampling occurred as noticed by MS.	Mostly No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	MS should in the future provide more detailed information instead of general statements.	Mostly No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	MS should in the future provide more detailed information instead of general statements.	Mostly No action needed
E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Are the deviations explained?	Data quality issues are handled elsewhere in the report.	Mostly No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	Data quality issues are handled elsewhere in the report.	Mostly No action needed
E4 Actions to avoid deviations			



<b>Member State:</b>		<b>France</b>	
	AR year	<b>2014</b>	
	Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2015	
	Version of the NP proposal	Version 7 of 3 Sep 2012	
		<b>EWG Answer</b>	
	<b>Overall compliance</b>	<b>Partly</b>	
		<b>EWG Comment</b>	<b>EWG judgementEWG - Action needed?</b>
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	MS should in the future provide more detailed information instead of general statements.	MostlyNo action needed
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	MS should in the future provide more detailed information instead of general statements.	MostlyNo action needed
<b>Region Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea</b>			
<b>E1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Is Table III.E.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	YesNo action needed
	Is Table III.E.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	YesNo action needed
	Is Table III.E.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	YesNo action needed
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	YesNo action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Some under-sampling occurred.	MostlyNo action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	Heavy over-sampling as well as moderat under-sampling is not commented in the text at all.	NoResubmit the text where explanations and financial implications are included.
	Are the deviations justified?	No explanations given in the text.	NoResubmit the text where justifications are included.
<b>E2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Are the deviations explained?	Data quality issues are handled elsewhere in the report.	MostlyNo action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	Data quality issues are handled elsewhere in the report.	MostlyNo action needed
<b>E4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid deviations</b>		
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	MS should in the future provide more detailed information instead of general statements.	MostlyNo action needed
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	MS should in the future provide more detailed information instead of general statements.	MostlyNo action needed
<b>Other regions</b>			
<b>E1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Is Table III.E.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	MS should check the consistency between all III.E tables since there are species selected in table III.E.1 taht do not appear in table III.E.2 and table III.E.3.	PartlyMS is requested to resubmit the complete set of III.E tables. MS is also requested to update the text accordingly when necessary.
	Is Table III.E.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	MS should check the consistency between all III.E tables since there are species selected in table III.E.1 taht do not appear in table III.E.2 and table III.E.3.	PartlyMS is requested to resubmit the complete set of III.E tables. MS is also requested to update the text accordingly when necessary.
	Is Table III.E.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	MS should check the consistency between all III.E tables since there are species selected in table III.E.1 taht do not appear in table III.E.2 and table III.E.3.	PartlyMS is requested to resubmit the complete set of III.E tables. MS is also requested to update the text accordingly when necessary.
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	Since the tables are not consistent it is difficult to evaluate the sampling scheme.	MostlyNo action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Since the tables are not consistent it is difficult to evaluate the sampling scheme.	MostlyNo action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	Cannot judge- no information provided	NoNext year and onwards, information on this should be included in AR for this region.
	Are the deviations justified?	Cannot judge- no information provided	NoNext year and onwards, information on this should be included in AR for this region.
<b>E2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Are the deviations explained?	No information on data quality is provided specifically for this region.	NoNext year and onwards, information on this should be included in AR for this region.
	Are the deviations justified?	No information on data quality is provided specifically for this region.	NoNext year and onwards, information on this should be included in AR for this region.
<b>E4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid deviations</b>		
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	NA	NA
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	NA	NA
<b>F</b>	<b>Transversal variables</b>		
	Is Table III.F.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	MS referred to 2013 altogether. Several effort variables are missing (eg. Total length of nets, Number of hooks, Number of pots and traps). (MS had applied for derogation for Number of rigs, Number of fishing operations, Soaking time in NP). MS has to provide energy consumption. This variable is missing both in IIIB3 and IIIF1.	PartlyMS should resubmit the table with the missing information filled in, according to NP. In case MS has failed or is unable to collect the data, either a sampling programme has to be implemented or a derogation has to be requested.
<b>F1</b>	<b>Capacity</b>		
<b>F11</b>	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	YesNo action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	YesNo action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA
<b>F13</b>	Actions to avoid deviations		
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA
<b>F2</b>	<b>Effort</b>		
<b>F21</b>	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	YesNo action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	MS referred to 2013 altogether. Several effort variables are missing (eg. Total length of nets, Number of hooks, Number of pots and traps). (MS had applied for derogation for Number of rigs, Number of fishing operations, Soaking time in NP). MS has to provide energy consumption. This variable is missing both in IIIB3 and IIIF1.	PartlyMS should resubmit the table with the missing information filled in, according to NP. In case MS has failed or is unable to collect the data, either a sampling programme has to be implemented or a derogation has to be requested.



<b>Member State:</b>		<b>France</b>					
<b>AR year</b>		<b>2014</b>					
<b>Version of the AR reviewed</b>		31 May 2015					
<b>Version of the NP proposal</b>		Version 7 of 3 Sep 2012					
		<b>EWG Answer</b>					
<b>Overall compliance</b>		<b>Partly</b>					
		<b>EWG Comment</b>	<b>EWG judgement</b>				
		<b>EWG - Action needed?</b>					
<b>B</b>	<b>A4</b> Actions to avoid deviations	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	NA	No action needed		
		Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed		
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed		
	<b>B1</b> Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Yes	Yes	No action needed		
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed		
		<b>B2</b> Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is Table IV.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
			Is Table IV.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	Number of enterprises is missing. Standard table should not be changed in format. (2015 guidelines to be used). Figures of indicators shall be presented in %	Partly	MS is requested to resubmit the table.	
			<b>B3</b> Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
				Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments		Yes	No action needed		
Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes		No action needed			
<b>B4</b> Actions to avoid deviations	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed			
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed			
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed			
	<b>B5</b> Follow-up of international recommendations	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	NA	No action needed		
Are the responsive actions described ?		No comments	NA	No action needed			
Are the responsive actions acceptable?		No comments	NA	No action needed			
<b>V    Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem</b>							
1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal							
Is Table V.1 consistent with AR guidelines?							
2 Actions to avoid deviations							
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described?							
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?							
<b>VI    Module for management and use of the data</b>							
1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal							
Is Table VI.1 consistent with AR guidelines?							
Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?							
Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?							
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?							
Are the deviations explained?							
Are the deviations justified?							
2 Actions to avoid deviations							
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?							
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?							
<b>VII    Follow-up of STECF recommendations (-&gt; dealt with under II.B.2)</b>							
<b>VIII    List of acronyms and abbreviations</b>							
Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?							
<b>IX    Comments, suggestions and reflections</b>							
Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?							
<b>X    References</b>							
Is there a complete list of references?							
<b>XI    Annexes</b>							
Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?							
Are relevant bilateral and/or multilateral agreements included?							



Member State:		Germany				
AR year		2014				
Version of the AR reviewed		May 2015				
Version of the NP proposal		Oct 2011				
		EWG Answer				
Overall compliance		Mostly				
		EWG Comment	EWG judgement			
		EWG - Action needed?				
I	General framework	Is Table I.A.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		Is Table I.A.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	Agreement with Poland about eel sampling is missing.	Mostly	In the future, MS should provide information about all agreements.	
II	National data collection organisation					
	A	National correspondent and participating institutes				
		Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		Is there a national DCF website available?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	Also presented in table II.B.1 (although not required as according to Guidelines, Table II.B.1 is the list of international meetings attended).	Yes	For the future MS should provide minutes of the national coordination meetings.	
	B	Regional and International coordination				
		B1	Attendance of international meetings			
			Is Table II.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	NA	NA	No action needed
		B2	Follow-up of regional and international recommendations and agreements			
			In Table II.B.2, are the relevant regional and international recommendations (RCM's/STECF/LM/Survey Planning Groups) listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector						
A	General description of the fishing sector					
	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed		
B	Economic variables					
	Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed		
Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic						
	Is Table III.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Achieved sample rate for inactive vessels is questionable. Activity of target and frame population should be available before the start of data collection, thus planned numbers should be set equal to frame population for census.	Mostly	MS should clarify the issue.		
	Is Table III.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	The codes for the data submission should not be used to name the segments. The segments should be named according to the Comm. Dec. 2010/93/EU Appendix III.	Yes	MS should follow the guidelines next year.		
	Is Table III.B.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	Clustered segments not indicated with an asterix.	Yes	Clustered segments should be marked with the asterix in the future.		
	B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		Are the deviations explained?	Not applicable, there are no deviations.	NA	No action needed	
		Are the deviations justified?	Not applicable, there are no deviations.	NA	No action needed	
	B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
		Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		Are the deviations explained?	Not applicable, there are no deviations.	NA	No action needed	
		Are the deviations justified?	Not applicable, there are no deviations.	NA	No action needed	
	B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations				
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Not applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No action needed	
		Are the responsive actions described?	Not applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No action needed	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Not applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No action needed	
	B4	Actions to avoid deviations				
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Not applicable, there are no deviations.	NA	No actions needed	
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Not applicable, there are no deviations.	NA	No actions needed	
	Other regions					
		Is Table III.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		Is Table III.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		Is Table III.B.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	NA	No action needed
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?			No comments	NA	No action needed	
Are the deviations explained?			No comments	NA	No action needed	
Are the deviations justified?			No comments	NA	No action needed	
B2			Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
B3		Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations				
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Not applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No actions needed	
		Are the responsive actions described?	Not applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No actions needed	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Not applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No actions needed	
B4		Actions to avoid deviations				
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Not applicable, there are no deviations.	NA	No actions needed	
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Not applicable, there are no deviations.	NA	No actions needed	
C		Biological metier related variables				
		Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed	
Baltic						
C1		Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
		Is Table III.C.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	In table III.C.1 some metiers are highlighted in yellow, however the significance is not apparent.	Yes	MS should remove the yellow highlight from future AR if it is insignificant or otherwise clarify highlighting.	
		Is Table III.C.4 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	

**Member State:**

Germany	
AR year	2014
Version of the AR reviewed	May 2015
Version of the NP proposal	Oct 2011
	EWG Answer
Overall compliance	Mostly

		EWG Comment	EWG judgement	EWG - Action needed?		
		Is Table III.C.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		Is Table III.C.6 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	The sampling scheme has changed from the original NP to randomised sampling in line with recommendations on Statistically Sound Sampling schemes.	Yes	No action needed	
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	2 of the 8 metiers planned for sampling were under sampled, and 1 metier: PTM_SPF_32-104_0_0 was not sampled at all. Significant under-sampling compared to planned targets for <i>Sprattus sprattus</i> (15,000 planned and only 5,980 individuals sampled), and <i>Clupea harengus</i> (34,400 planned and only 10,043 individuals sampled). <i>Gadus morhua</i> was also under sampled with 20,050 planned and 17,429 individuals sampled.	Mostly	No action needed	
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
			No comments	Yes	No action needed	
			No comments	Yes	No action needed	
North Sea and Eastern Arctic	C2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
		Actions to avoid deviations				
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	C1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is Table III.C.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	In table III.C.1 some metiers are highlighted in yellow, however the significance is not apparent.	Yes	MS should remove the yellow highlight from future AR if it is insignificant or otherwise clarify highlighting.
			Is Table III.C.4 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Is Table III.C.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Is Table III.C.6 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	The sampling scheme has changed from the original NP to randomised sampling in line with recommendations on Statistically Sound Sampling schemes.	Yes	No action needed
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Of the 7 metiers planned to be sampled by Germany directly, 4 metiers were either under sampled or not sampled at all. Only 1 of the 2 planned trips on OTB_DEF_>=120_0_0 was achieved and no observer trip was completed on OTM_SPF_32-69_0_0 (1 was planned). 6 of the 8 planned trips on TBB_CRU_16-31_0_0 were achieved. On OTM_SPF_32-69_0_0 only 1 of the 2 planned trips was achieved.	Partly	MS should endeavour to reach targets in future programmes.
			Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
				No comments	Yes	No action needed
	No comments	Yes	No action needed			
North Atlantic	C2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
		Actions to avoid deviations				
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	C1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is Table III.C.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Is Table III.C.4 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Is Table III.C.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Is Table III.C.6 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	The sampling scheme has changed from the original NP to randomised sampling in line with recommendations on Statistically Sound Sampling schemes.	Yes	No action needed
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	OTM_DEF_100- 129_0_0 was not be sampled and 2 of the 3 planned trips on OTM_SPF_32-69 were achieved.	Mostly	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Other areas (Long Distance)	C2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
		Actions to avoid deviations				
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	C1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is Table III.C.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Is Table III.C.4 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Is Table III.C.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Is Table III.C.6 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	C2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
		Actions to avoid deviations				
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
D	Recreational fisheries		Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?	No comments	NA	No action needed
				No comments	NA	No action needed
				No comments	Yes	No action needed





Member State:		Germany						
AR year		2014						
Version of the AR reviewed		May 2015						
Version of the NP proposal		Oct 2011						
		EWG Answer						
Overall compliance		Mostly						
		EWG Comment	EWG judgement					
		EWG - Action needed?						
E4	Actions to avoid deviations	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed			
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed			
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed			
F	Transversal variables	Is Table III.F.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Reference year should be 2014 instead of 2013.	Yes	MS should provide appropriate reference year in the future.			
	F1 Capacity	F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed		
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed		
			Are the deviations explained?	Not applicable, there are no deviations.	NA	No action needed		
			Are the deviations justified?	Not applicable, there are no deviations.	NA	No action needed		
	F13	Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Not applicable, there are no deviations.	NA	No action needed		
			Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Not applicable, there are no deviations.	NA	No action needed		
F2 Effort	F21 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed			
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed			
		Are the deviations explained?	Not applicable, there are no deviations.	NA	No action needed			
		Are the deviations justified?	Not applicable, there are no deviations.	NA	No action needed			
	F22	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed		
			Are the deviations explained?	Not applicable, there are no deviations.	NA	No action needed		
			Are the deviations justified?	Not applicable, there are no deviations.	NA	No action needed		
	F23	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	NA	No action needed		
			Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed		
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed		
	F24	Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Not applicable, there are no deviations.	NA	No action needed		
			Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Not applicable, there are no deviations.	NA	No action needed		
F3 Landings	F31 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed			
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed			
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed			
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed			
	F32	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed		
			Are the deviations explained?	Not applicable, there are no deviations.	NA	No action needed		
			Are the deviations justified?	Not applicable, there are no deviations.	NA	No action needed		
	F33	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed		
			Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed		
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed		
	F34	Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Not applicable, there are no deviations.	NA	No action needed		
			Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Not applicable, there are no deviations.	NA	No action needed		
G	Research surveys at sea	G1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is Table III.G.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Column K not split up for different sampling types, although the types are mentioned.	Mostly	AR2015: MS is requested to split up the type of sampling activities in column K so it is clear how many hauls of different sampling types have been carried out.		
			Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	IBTS, Beam trawl survey and NS herring larvae survey suffered from bad weather	Mostly	No action needed		
	G2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	IBTS, Beam trawl survey and NS herring larvae survey suffered from bad weather	Mostly	No action needed		
			Are the deviations explained?	IBTS, Beam trawl survey and NS herring larvae survey suffered from bad weather	Yes	No action needed		
			Are the deviations justified?	IBTS, Beam trawl survey and NS herring larvae survey suffered from bad weather	Yes	No action needed		
			Is a map of each survey with achieved sampling activities provided?	No comments	Yes	No action needed		
			Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Changes in survey design were only made within the requirements of the responsible planning/working groups.	Yes	No action needed		
			Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed		
	G4	Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed		
			Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed		
IV	Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry	A Collection of data concerning the aquaculture	Is Table IV.A.1 consistent with AR guidelines	No comments	Yes	No action needed		
			Is Table IV.A.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed		
	A1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is Table IV.A.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	Old guidelines were used.	Yes	MS should use new gudelines in the future.		
			Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed		
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed		
			Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed		
			Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed		
			A2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
					Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
					Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
A3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations							

Member State:		Germany	
AR year		2014	
Version of the AR reviewed		May 2015	
Version of the NP proposal		Oct 2011	
		EWG Answer	
Overall compliance		Mostly	
		EWG Comment	EWG judgement
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Not applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA
	Are the responsive actions described ?	Not applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Not applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA
A4	Actions to avoid deviations		
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	Yes
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes
B	Collection of data concerning the processing industry		
	Is Table IV.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes
	Is Table IV.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	Old guidelines were used.	Yes
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes
B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Not applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA
	Are the responsive actions described ?	Not applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Not applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA
B4	Actions to avoid deviations		
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	Yes
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes
V	Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem		
	1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table V.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes
	2 Actions to avoid deviations		
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described?	Not applicable, there are no deviations.	NA
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Not applicable, there are no deviations.	NA
VI	Module for management and use of the data		
	1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table VI.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Some footnotes marks in the table VI.1 are not explained.	Yes
	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes
	Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	No comments	Yes
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes
	Are the deviations explained?	Not applicable, there are no deviations.	NA
	Are the deviations justified?	Not applicable, there are no deviations.	NA
	2 Actions to avoid deviations		
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Not applicable, there are no deviations.	NA
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Not applicable, there are no deviations.	NA
VII	Follow-up of STECF recommendations		
VIII	List of acronyms and abbreviations		
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comments	Yes
IX	Comments, suggestions and reflections		
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	The comment is about mandatory information in Table IV.A.3 and Table IV.B.2.	Yes
X	References		
	Is there a complete list of references?	No comments	Yes
XI	Annexes		
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	No comments	Yes
	Are relevant bilateral and/or multilateral agreements included?	No comments	Yes









Member State:	Greece	
	AR year	
	Version of the AR reviewed	
	Version of the NP proposal	
		Overall compliance

	<b>G4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid deviations</b>	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ? Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?
<b>IV</b>	<b>Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry</b>		
<b>A</b>	<b>Collection of data concerning the aquaculture</b>		
			Is Table IV.A.1 consistent with AR guidelines
			Is Table IV.A.2 consistent with AR guidelines?
			Is Table IV.A.3 consistent with AR guidelines?
	<b>A1</b>	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?
			Are the deviations justified?
	<b>A2</b>	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
			Is respective data quality information given?
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?
	<b>A3</b>	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?
	<b>A4</b>	Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ? Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?
<b>B</b>	<b>Collection of data concerning the processing industry</b>		
			Is Table IV.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?
			Is Table IV.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?
	<b>B1</b>	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?
	<b>B2</b>	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?
	<b>B3</b>	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?
	<b>B4</b>	Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ? Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?
<b>V</b>	<b>Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem</b>		
	1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is Table V.1 consistent with AR guidelines?
	2	Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described? Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?
<b>VI</b>	<b>Module for management and use of the data</b>		
	1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is Table VI.1 consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?
	2	Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ? Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?
<b>VII</b>	<b>Follow-up of STECF recommendations (-&gt; dealt with under II.B.2)</b>		
<b>VIII</b>	<b>List of acronyms and abbreviations</b>		
			Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?
<b>IX</b>	<b>Comments, suggestions and reflections</b>		
			Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?
<b>X</b>	<b>References</b>		
			Is there a complete list of references?
<b>XI</b>	<b>Annexes</b>		
			Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text? Are relevant bilateral and/or multilateral agreements included?

[illegible]









Member State:

Ireland	
AR year	2014
Version of the AR reviewed	29 May 2015
Version of the NP proposal	28 March 2013
	EWG Answer
Overall compliance	Mostly

		EWG	
		judgement	EWG Action needed?
F2	F13	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes
	F21	Are the deviations justified?	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	NA
	F22	Are the deviations explained?	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	NA
	F23	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments
		Are the responsive actions described ?	NA
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No action needed
F3	F31	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes
	F32	Are the deviations justified?	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	NA
	F33	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA
	F34	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes
G	G1	Are the deviations justified?	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments
	G2	Are the deviations explained?	Yes
		Are the deviations justified?	NA
	G3	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA
	G4	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes
		Are the deviations justified?	NA
IV	A	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments
	A1	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA
	A2	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments
	A3	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Yes
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No action needed
	B	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described ?	No action needed

Member State:	Ireland
AR year	2014
Version of the AR reviewed	29 May 2015
Version of the NP proposal	28 March 2013
	EWG Answer
Overall compliance	Mostly

		EWG judgement	EWG Action needed?
B1	Is Table IV.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	MS has to clarify to which year data collection refers. Next year and onwards MS should report the type of data collection schemes in an appropriate way
	Is Table IV.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Next year and onwards MS should follow definition of guidelines reagarding quality indicators, also considering that definitions may differ according to different types of data collection schemes
B2	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	MS has to clarify the type of data collection scheme for turnover
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	MS has to clarify the type of data collection scheme for turnover
	Are the deviations explained?	Mostly	MS has to explain why the census was not applied
	Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	MS has to explain why the census was not applied
B3	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	No action needed
B4	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	No action needed
V	Actions to avoid deviations	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Yes	No action needed
V	Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem		
	1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
VI	Is Table V.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	No action needed
	2 Actions to avoid deviations		
VI	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described?	NA	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	NA	No action needed
VI	Module for management and use of the data		
	1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
VII	Is Table VI.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	No action needed
	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	In the future, MS to update the table
VIII	Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	Yes	No action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	No action needed
IX	Are the deviations explained?	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	No action needed
X	2 Actions to avoid deviations		
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	NA	No action needed
XI	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	NA	No action needed
	Follow-up of STECF recommendations (-> dealt with under II.B.2)		
VIII	List of acronyms and abbreviations		
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	No action needed
IX	Comments, suggestions and reflections		
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	NA	No action needed
X	References		
	Is there a complete list of references?	Yes	No action needed
XI	Annexes		
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	Yes	No action needed
	Are relevant bilateral and/or multilateral agreements included?	Yes	No action needed

Member State:		Italy			
AR year		2014			
Version of the AR reviewed		May 2015			
Version of the NP proposal		NP 2011-2013 - December 2010			
		EWG Answer			
Overall compliance		Mostly			
		EWG Comment	EWG judgement		
		EWG - Action needed?			
I	General framework	Is Table I.A.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Is Table I.A.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	This is a regional agreement rather than a formal multilateral agreement	Yes	No action needed
II	National data collection organisation				
A	National correspondent and participating institutes	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Is there a national DCF website available?	Existence of the Website mentionned in the AR text but website Link not provided.	Yes	MS to provide information about the Website link.
		Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?	NA	NA	MS to provide information about the Website link.
		Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	Description is too brief ("to discuss the implementation of the National Program")	Partly	For the future MS should provide minutes of the national cooordination meetings.
B	Regional and International coordination				
B1	Attendance of international meetings	Is Table II.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	NA	NA	No action needed
B2	Follow-up of regional and international recommendations and agreements	In Table II.B.2, are the relevant regional and international recommendations (RCM's/STECF/LM/Survey Planning Groups) listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
III	Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector				
A	General description of the fishing sector	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	No major changes reported	Yes	No action needed
		Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?			
B	Economic variables				
SUPRA-REGION Mediterranean and Black Sea					
		Is Table III.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Length classes are not coded according to guidelines (e.g. one case when indicated over 40 m. for other segments 40 or larger)	Yes	Length classes should be coded according to guidelines in future AR. There should be no empty cells in table III.B.1.
		Is Table III.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	Nomenclature for fleet segment names should be the same, some of segments using gear code, some full name. Length classes are not consistent across tables III.B.1 and III.B.2 as well as not in line Commission Decision.	Yes	Length classes should be coded according to guidelines in future AR
		Is Table III.B.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	Response rate for depreciated replacement value should be 100 instead of reported 1. In case of other income Response rate and Achieved sample rate for census should be the same figures. Achieved sample rate in III.B.3 for almost all variables not exactly consistent with III.B.1, one of examples is fro PS 6-12 when Achieved s.r. in III.B.1 is 54%, whereas in III.B.3 the highest value of achieved s.r. among all items is 44,4%. Some cells are not filled.	Mostly	MS has to clarify inconsistency in response rates between tables IIIB1 and IIIB3 and resubmit regarding empty cells.
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?			
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Financial position is missing for some segments which is not consistent with NP. In AR this deviation is not indicated. Considering the size of Italian fleet this issue is minor.	Mostly	MS should make additional effort in future to ensure complete data sets
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
B4	Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
SUPRA-REGION Other Fishing Regions					
		Is Table III.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Is Table III.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Is Table III.B.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed



Member State:		Italy						
AR year		2014						
Version of the AR reviewed		May 2015						
Version of the NP proposal		NP 2011-2013 - December 2010						
		EWG Answer						
Overall compliance		Mostly						
			EWG					
			judgement					
			EWG Comment	EWG - Action needed?				
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed			
		Is respective data quality information given?						
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed			
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed			
B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		No comments	NA	No action needed			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	NA	No action needed			
		Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	NA	No action needed			
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed			
B4	Actions to avoid deviations							
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed			
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed			
C	Biological metier related variables							
		Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	Considering that MS fishing effort in CECAF is negligible, and as suggested for several years, it would be clearer if a derogation was requested and approved by EC or through an RCM LDF agreement (nothing in tables I.A.1 and I.A.2).	Yes	Italy to request a derogation to sample in CECAF			
Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea	C1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal						
			Is Table III.C.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed		
			Is Table III.C.4 consistent with AR guidelines?	One wrong code for gillnetters GSA 10 line 4	Yes	No action needed		
			Is Table III.C.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed		
			Is Table III.C.6 consistent with AR guidelines?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed		
			Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed		
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Only 19 sampling frames / metiers fully or almost fully (> 80%) achieved on 55 references to be sampled. Main of the others are mostly achieved. Important deviations observed in several GSAs for netters, OTB_DWS, LLS_DEF and PS_LPF. Globally balance planned between at sea and on shore sampled are respected. For some metiers preference was surely given to one or the other to achieve targets planned by the easiest protocol.	Mostly	No action needed		
			Are the deviations explained?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed		
			Are the deviations justified?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed		
			C2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
					Are the deviations explained?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed
C4	Actions to avoid deviations							
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed			
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed			
D	Recreational fisheries							
		Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?	No comments	Yes	No action needed			
					MS is requested to add information on sharks in Table III.D.1 as now it is not clear if data are available and not presented, or not available at all.			
		Is Table III.D.1 consistent with the AR guidelines?	It is not clear if the data on shark are available and not presented, or not available at all.	Mostly				
Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea	D1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal						
			Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed		
						MS is requested to add information on sharks as now it is not clear if data are available and not presented, or not available at all.		
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Data on sharks recreational fishing are missing (since 2011 MS is implementing a project Sharklife and a study)	Mostly			
			Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed		
			Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed		
			D2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
					Are the deviations explained?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed
					Are the deviations justified?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed
			D4	Actions to avoid deviations				
					Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed
					Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed
E	Biological stock-related variables							
		Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed			
Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea	E1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal						
			Is Table III.E.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comment	Yes	No action needed		
				It is difficult to analyse the consistency between planning and samplings, as table III.E.2 is reported by "all GSA" and table III.E.3 is reported by separate GSA.	Yes	From next year onwards MS to ensure the consistency among III.E. tables.		
			Is Table III.E.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed		
			Is Table III.E.3 consistent with AR guidelines?					
				It is difficult to analyse the consistency between NP and AR, as table III.E.3 is reported by "all GSAs" in NP and by separate GSA in AR.	Partly	From next year onwards MS to ensure the consistency among III.E. tables.		



Member State:		Italy			
AR year		2014			
Version of the AR reviewed		May 2015			
Version of the NP proposal		NP 2011-2013 - December 2010			
		EWG Answer			
Overall compliance		Mostly			
			EWG judgement	EWG - Action needed?	
			EWG Comment		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	The NP proposal presented planed targets by "All GSA's" per species in Table III.E.1 - III.E.3. Sampling should be reported by individual GSA in Tables III.E.2 and III.E.3. The AR text and III.E tables contradict each other. Some very significant under sampling Lophius spp., Eledone moschata, Eutrigla gurnardus, Trachurus trachurus and Trachurus meditteraneus	Partly	From next year onwards MS to ensure the consistency among III.E. tables.	
		No Comment	Yes	No action needed	
		No Comment	Mostly	No action needed	
E2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
	Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	There is no explanation why in the AR2014, data are presented by GSA combined while in the planning, it is mentioned data to be collected by stock.	Mostly	MS to clarify why the GSA's were combined	
		There is no explanation why in the AR2014, data are presented by GSA combined while in the planning, it is mentioned data to be collected by stock.	Mostly	MS to clarify why the GSA's were combined	
E4	Actions to avoid deviations				
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?  Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No actions to remedy deviations are described	No	MS to provide details of what actions they will take to avoid deviations	
		No actions to remedy deviations are described	NA	MS to provide details of what actions they will take to avoid deviations	
F	Transversal variables				
F1	Capacity	Is Table III.F.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Energy consumption not provided either in IIIB3 or IIIF1.	Yes	MS should provide energy consumption variable either in IIIB3 or in IIIF1.
F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		No comments	NA	No action needed	
		No comments	NA	No action needed	
F13	Actions to avoid deviations Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ? Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?				
		No comments	NA	No action needed	
		No comments	NA	No action needed	
F2	Effort				
F21	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		No comments	NA	No action needed	
		No comments	NA	No action needed	
F22	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?				
		No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		No comments	NA	No action needed	
		No comments	NA	No action needed	
F23	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
		No comments	NA	No action needed	
		No comments	NA	No action needed	
F24	Actions to avoid deviations Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ? Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
		No comments	NA	No action needed	
F3	Landings				
F31	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		No comments	NA	No action needed	
		No comments	NA	No action needed	
F32	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		No comments	NA	No action needed	
		No comments	NA	No action needed	
F33	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
		No comments	NA	No action needed	
		No comments	NA	No action needed	
F34	Actions to avoid deviations Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ? Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
		No comments	NA	No action needed	
G	Research surveys at sea				
G1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	

Member State:		Italy		
AR year		2014		
Version of the AR reviewed		May 2015		
Version of the NP proposal		NP 2011-2013 - December 2010		
		EWG Answer		
Overall compliance		Mostly		
		EWG Comment	EWG judgement	
		EWG - Action needed?		
G2	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Reasons: administrative and bureaucratic issues	Mostly	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is a map of each survey with achieved sampling activities provided?	No comments	Yes	AR2015: MS is requested to put maps in text, as defined in AR guidelines
	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	G4	<b>Actions to avoid deviations</b>		
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?		No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?		No comments	Yes	No action needed
<b>IV Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry</b>				
<b>A Collection of data concerning the aquaculture</b>				
A1	Is Table IV.A.1 consistent with AR guidelines	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table IV.A.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table IV.A.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	Census would be more appropriate sampling scheme for the variable "number of enterprises" and response rate 100%.	Yes	No action needed
	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
A2	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
A3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed
A4	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	<b>Actions to avoid deviations</b>			
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
B	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	<b>Collection of data concerning the processing industry</b>			
	Is Table IV.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
B1	Is Table IV.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	In text IMS state that achieved sample rate for main segment was 44%, a slight difference compare to IV.B.2. If the number of employees was raising factor and available for all population from register, achieved sample rate might also be a 100%. Anyway its minor issue	Yes	MS should clarify the issue regarding sampling scheme for number of employees since it is a raising factor
	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed
B4	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	<b>Actions to avoid deviations</b>			
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed
V	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	<b>Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem</b>			
	1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
2	Is Table V.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	EWG assumed 'Q' in cell H11 means 'quarter'	Yes	AR2015: MS is requested to specify 'Q' (we now assumed it means quarter)
	<b>Actions to avoid deviations</b>			
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed
VI	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed
	<b>Module for management and use of the data</b>			
	1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is Table VI.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed

Member State:	Italy
AR year	2014
Version of the AR reviewed	May 2015
Version of the NP proposal	NP 2011-2013 - December 2010
	EWG Answer
Overall compliance	Mostly

	EWG Comment	EWG judgement	EWG - Action needed?
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No action needed
Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
2 Actions to avoid deviations			
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	NA	NA	No action needed
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
VII Follow-up of STECF recomm. (-> dealt with under II.B.2)			
VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations			
Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
IX Comments, suggestions and reflections			
Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	No comments	NA	No action needed
X References			
Is there a complete list of references?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
XI Annexes			
Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are relevant bilateral and/or multilateral agreements included?	No comments	NA	No action needed



<b>Member State:</b>		Latvia	
AR year		2014	
Version of the AR reviewed		May 2015	
Version of the NP proposal		updated for 2012	
		EWG Answer	
Overall compliance		Yes	
		EWG Comment	EWG judgement
			EWG - Action needed?
I General framework		Is Table I.A.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments
		Is Table I.A.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments
II National data collection organisation			
A National correspondent and participating institutes		Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	No comments
		Is there a national DCF website available?	No comments
		Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?	No comments
		Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	No comments
B Regional and International coordination			
B1 Attendance of international meetings		Is Table II.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments
		Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	NA
B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations and agreements		In Table II.B.2, are the relevant regional and international recommendations (RCM's/STECF/LM/Survey Planning Groups) listed?	No comments
		Are the responsive actions described?	No comments
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments
III Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector			
A General description of the fishing sector		Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	No comments
B Economic variables		Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?	No comments
SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea, Eastern Arctic, North Atlantic			
		Is Table III.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Naming of fleet segments should be in line with DCF. In particular, segment "self consumption coastal fishery" not in line with guidelines. Data reported by region and not by supraregion.
		Is Table III.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments
		Is Table III.B.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	Unclear why segment of "self-consumption" fishermen as listed in IIIB1 is not described.
B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	Segment named "self -consumption coastal fishery" is excluded from the economic survey (it represents 48% of total number of vessels in the FR). No derogations exist
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	segment named "self -consumption coastal fishery" is excluded from the economic survey (it represents 48% of total number of vessels in the FR). No derogations exist
		Are the deviations explained?	The explanation given for exclusion of "self-consumption coastal fishery" is not enough argued (it is only reportde that this segment is considered as recreational fishery, ebiven if it is included in the FR)
		Are the deviations justified?	Justification given for exclusion of "self-consumption coastal fishery" is poor and not argued
B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Is respective data quality information given?	No comments
		Are the deviations explained?	NA
		Are the deviations justified?	NA
B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.
		Are the responsive actions described?	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.
B4 Actions to avoid deviations		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No
SUPRA-REGION Other Fishing Regions			
		Is Table III.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Supra region nomenclature incorrect (minor).
		Is Table III.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments
		Is Table III.B.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments
B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments
B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Is respective data quality information given?	No comments
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments

<b>Member State:</b>		Latvia	
	AR year	2014	
	Version of the AR reviewed	May 2015	
	Version of the NP proposal	updated for 2012	
		EWG Answer	
	Overall compliance	Yes	
		EWG Comment	EWG judgement
			EWG - Action needed?
C	B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No action needed
	B4	Actions to avoid deviations	No comments
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	NA
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No action needed
Baltic		Biological metier related variables	
		Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	No comments
	C1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
		Is Table III.C.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments
		Is Table III.C.4 consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes
		Is Table III.C.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No action needed
		Is Table III.C.6 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes
North Atlantic			
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly
		Are the deviations explained?	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes
	C2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes
		Are the deviations justified?	No action needed
	C4	Actions to avoid deviations	No comments
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Yes
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No action needed
Other regions	C1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
		Is Table III.C.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments
		Is Table III.C.4 consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes
		Is Table III.C.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No action needed
		Is Table III.C.6 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes
		Are the deviations explained?	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes
	C2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes
		Are the deviations justified?	No action needed
	C4	Actions to avoid deviations	No comments
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Yes
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No action needed
	C1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
		Is Table III.C.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments
		Is Table III.C.4 consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes
		Is Table III.C.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No action needed
		Is Table III.C.6 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes
		Are the deviations explained?	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes
	C2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes
		Are the deviations justified?	No action needed
	C4	Actions to avoid deviations	No comments
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Yes
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No action needed
	C1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
		Is Table III.C.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments
		Is Table III.C.4 consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes
		Is Table III.C.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No action needed
		Is Table III.C.6 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes
		Are the deviations explained?	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes
	C2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes
		Are the deviations justified?	No action needed
	C4	Actions to avoid deviations	No comments
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Yes
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No action needed
	D	Recreational fisheries	
		Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?	No comments
			Yes
			No action needed
		Is Table III.D.1 consistent with the AR guidelines?	Yes
			No action needed
	D1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes
		Are the deviations explained?	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.
			NA
			No action needed
	D2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.
		Are the deviations explained?	NA
		Are the deviations justified?	No action needed
	D4	Actions to avoid deviations	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	NA
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No action needed
	E	Biological stock-related variables	
		Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	No comments
	E1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
		Is Table III.E.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes
		Is Table III.E.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No action needed
			No comments



Member State:	Latvia		
	AR year	2014	
	Version of the AR reviewed	May 2015	
	Version of the NP proposal	updated for 2012	
		EWG Answer	
	Overall compliance	Yes	

Member State:		Latvia				
AR year		2014				
Version of the AR reviewed		May 2015				
Version of the NP proposal		updated for 2012				
		EWG Answer				
Overall compliance		Yes				
		EWG Comment	EWG judgement			
		EWG - Action needed?				
G	F33	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
		Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	No comments	NA	No action needed	
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
		Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
	F34	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
		Actions to avoid deviations	No comments	NA	No action needed	
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
	Research surveys at sea					
	G1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
Is Table III.G.1 consistent with AR guidelines?		No comments	Yes	No action needed		
Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?		No comments	Yes	No action needed		
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		No comments	Yes	No action needed		
Are the deviations explained?		No comments	Yes	No action needed		
Are the deviations justified?		No comments	Yes	No action needed		
G2		Is a map of each survey with achieved sampling activities provided?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
G4	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed		
	Actions to avoid deviations	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	Yes	No action needed		
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	Yes	No action needed	
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?				
IV Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry						
A	Collection of data concerning the aquaculture					
	Is Table IV.A.1 consistent with AR guidelines	Yes, no data collection	Yes	No action needed		
	Is Table IV.A.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	NA	No action needed		
	Is Table IV.A.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	NA	No action needed		
	A1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	NA	No action needed	
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
	A2	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
		Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	NA	No action needed	
Is respective data quality information given?		No comments	NA	No action needed		
Are the deviations explained?		No comments	NA	No action needed		
A3	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed		
	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	No comments	NA	No action needed		
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	NA	No action needed		
	Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed		
A4	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed		
	Actions to avoid deviations	No comments	NA	No action needed		
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed		
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?					
B	Collection of data concerning the processing industry					
	Is Table IV.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Formula for calculation of achieved sample rate/planned sample rate is wrong in the guidelines	Yes	No action needed		
	Is Table IV.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed		
	B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	NA	No action needed	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No action needed	
	B2	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	NA	No action needed	
		Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
Are the deviations explained?		No comments	NA	No action needed		
B3	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed		
	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	No comments	NA	No action needed		
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	NA	No action needed		
	Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed		
B4	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed		
	Actions to avoid deviations	No comments	NA	No action needed		
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed		
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?					
V Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem						
1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal					
	Is Table V.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed		
	2	Actions to avoid deviations				
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed	
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed	
	VI Module for management and use of the data					
	1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
		Is Table VI.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?		No comments	Yes	No action needed		
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		No comments	Yes	No action needed		
Are the deviations explained?		NA	NA	No action needed		
Are the deviations justified?		NA	NA	No action needed		
2		Actions to avoid deviations	NA	NA	No action needed	
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	NA	NA	No action needed	
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?				
VII Follow-up of STECF recommendations (-> dealt with under II.B.2)						
VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations						
		Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
IX Comments, suggestions and reflections						
		Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
X References						

Member State:

Latvia

AR year

Version of the AR reviewed

Version of the NP proposal

2014

May 2015

updated for 2012

EWG Answer

Overall compliance

Yes

XI Annexes

Is there a complete list of references?

Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?

Are relevant bilateral and/or multilateral agreements included?

EWG Comment

EWG judgement

EWG - Action needed?

No comments

Yes

No action needed

No comments

Yes

No action needed

No comments

Yes

No action needed



Member State:		Lithuania			
AR year		2014			
Version of the AR reviewed		May 2015			
Version of the NP proposal		updated for 2013			
		EWG Answer			
Overall compliance		Mostly			
			EWG Comment	EWG judgement	EWG - Action needed?
I	General framework	Is Table I.A.1 consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table I.A.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
II	National data collection organisation		No comments	Yes	No action needed
A	National correspondent and participating institutes	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Is there a national DCF website available?	Information provided is a generic website on fisheries services.	Partly	MS to provide information about the existence of the website. Otherwise, MS shall implement a DCF website until the end of current year
		Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)? Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	Nothing found on DCF on the website	Partly	MS to provide information about the existence of the website. Otherwise, MS shall implement a DCF website until the end of current year
			No comments	Yes	For the future MS should provide minutes of the national cooordination meetings.
B	Regional and International coordination				
B1	Attendance of international meetings	Is Table II.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	NA	NA	No action needed
B2	Follow-up of regional and international recommendations and agreements	In Table II.B.2, are the relevant regional and international recommendations (RCM's/STECF/LM/Survey Planning Groups) listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			No comments	Yes	No action needed
			No comments	Yes	No action needed
III	Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector				
A	General description of the fishing sector	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			All supra regions presented in the same section.	Yes	No action needed
B	Economic variables	Is information under III.B.1-4 for each supra-region given? <b>SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea, Eastern Arctic, North Atlantic</b>	Table III.B.1 should contain information on segments which are not clustered or, in case of clustering, for clusters. Number of vessels in table IIIB2 does not match with number of vessels in table IIIB1, no explanation is given	Mostly	In future reports MS should follow guidelines on reporting clustering segments for data collection
		Is Table III.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			No comments	Yes	No action needed
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			No comments	Yes	No action needed
			No comments	NA	No action needed
			No comments	NA	No action needed
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			No comments	Yes	No action needed
			No comments	Yes	No action needed
B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
			No comments	NA	No action needed
			No comments	NA	No action needed
B4	Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?  Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Actions to avoid deviations should be reported under paragraph III.B.4 and not under paragraph III.B.1	Yes	Actions to avoid deviations should be reported under paragraph III.B.4 in future AR
			Actions to avoid deviations should be reported under paragraph III.B.4 and not under paragraph III.B.1	Yes	Actions to avoid deviations should be reported under paragraph III.B.4 in future AR
<b>SUPRA-REGION Other Fishing Regions</b>					
		Is Table III.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			No comments	Yes	No action needed
			No comments	Yes	No action needed
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			No comments	Yes	No action needed
			No comments	NA	No action needed
			No comments	NA	No action needed
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			No comments	NA	No action needed
			No comments	NA	No action needed
B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No action needed
			Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No action needed
			Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No action needed
B4	Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?  Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Actions to avoid deviations should be reported under paragraph III.B.4 and not under paragraph III.B.1	Yes	Actions to avoid deviations should be reported under paragraph III.B.4 in future AR
			Actions to avoid deviations should be reported under paragraph III.B.4 and not under paragraph III.B.1	Yes	Actions to avoid deviations should be reported under paragraph III.B.4 in future AR
C	Biological metier related variables	Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<b>Baltic</b>					
C1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is Table III.C.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comment	Yes	No action needed







Member State:

Lithuania	
AR year	2014
Version of the AR reviewed	May 2015
Version of the NP proposal	updated for 2013
	EWG Answer
Overall compliance	Mostly

		EWG Comment	EWG judgement	EWG - Action needed?
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No fishery took place in 2014 therefore no sampling could be performed on Trachurus spp.	Yes	No action needed
		No comment	Yes	No action needed
		No comment	Yes	No action needed
E2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
		No comment	Yes	No action needed
E4	Actions to avoid deviations Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ? Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
		No comment	Yes	No action needed
F	Transversal variables Is Table III.F.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
F1	Capacity			
F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	NA	No action needed
		No comments	NA	No action needed
F13	Actions to avoid deviations Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ? Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
		No comments	NA	No action needed
F2	Effort			
F21	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	NA	No action needed
		No comments	NA	No action needed
F22	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	NA	No action needed
		No comments	NA	No action needed
F23	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
		No comments	NA	No action needed
		No comments	NA	No action needed
F24	Actions to avoid deviations Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ? Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
		No comments	NA	No action needed
F3	Landings			
F31	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	NA	No action needed
		No comments	NA	No action needed
F32	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	NA	No action needed
		No comments	NA	No action needed
F33	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
		No comments	NA	No action needed
		No comments	NA	No action needed
F34	Actions to avoid deviations Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ? Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
		No comments	NA	No action needed
G	Research surveys at sea			
G1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 consistent with AR guidelines? Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  Is a map of each survey with achieved sampling activities provided?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Achieved targets lower than planned in the NP, but consistent with targets set by the survey planning group.	Mostly	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
G2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
G4	Actions to avoid deviations Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ? Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	Yes	No action needed
		Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	Yes	No action needed
IV	Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry			
A	Collection of data concerning the aquaculture  Is Table IV.A.1 consistent with AR guidelines Is Table IV.A.2 consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	Data collection for for fresh water species aquaculture is not foreseen and therefore excluded from data collection program	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	NA	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
A1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
		No comments	NA	No action needed
		No comments	NA	No action needed
		No comments	NA	No action needed
A2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
		No comments	NA	No action needed
		No comments	NA	No action needed
A3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed
		No comments	NA	No action needed

Member State:		Lithuania	
AR year		2014	
Version of the AR reviewed		May 2015	
Version of the NP proposal		updated for 2013	
		EWG Answer	
Overall compliance		Mostly	
		EWG	
		judgement	
		EWG - Action needed?	
EWG Comment			
No comments			
A4	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		
	Actions to avoid deviations		
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	NA	No action needed
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?		NA	No action needed
B	Collection of data concerning the processing industry		
Is Table IV.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?		No comments	Yes
Is Table IV.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?		No comments	Yes
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?		No comments	Yes
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		No comments	Yes
Are the deviations explained?		No comments	NA
Are the deviations justified?		No comments	NA
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
Is respective data quality information given?		No comments	Yes
Are the deviations explained?		No comments	NA
Are the deviations justified?		No comments	NA
B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		No comments	NA
Are the responsive actions described ?		No comments	NA
Are the responsive actions acceptable?		No comments	NA
B4	Actions to avoid deviations		
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?		No comments	NA
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?		No comments	NA
V	Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem		
1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
Is Table V.1 consistent with AR guidelines?		No surveys in the NS&EA and NA regions, so no data collection on indicators 1-4 in these regions possible. Not clear why time lag is always 13 months; position reports only relevant for indicators 5-7	Mostly
2 Actions to avoid deviations			
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described?		Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?		Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA
VI	Module for management and use of the data		
1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
Is Table VI.1 consistent with AR guidelines?		Table complete consistent with table I.A.1	Yes
Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		No comments	Yes
Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?		No comments	Yes
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		No comments	Yes
Are the deviations explained?		No comments	Yes
Are the deviations justified?		No comments	Yes
2 Actions to avoid deviations			
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?		No comments	Yes
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?		No comments	Yes
VII	Follow-up of STECF recommendatic (-> dealt with under II.B.2)		
VIII	List of acronyms and abbreviations		
Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?		No comments	yes
IX	Comments, suggestions and reflections		
Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?		No comments	NA
X	References		
Is there a complete list of references?		No comments	yes
XI	Annexes		
Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?		No comments	yes
Are relevant bilateral and/or multilateral agreements included?		No comments	yes



Member State:		Malta		
AR year		2014		
Version of the AR reviewed		May 2015		
Version of the NP proposal		NP 2011-2013 amended for 2013 - March 2013		
		EWG Answer		
Overall compliance		Mostly		
		EWG Comment	EWG judgement	
			EWG - Action needed?	
I	General framework	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table I.A.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table I.A.2 consistent with AR guidelines?			
II	National data collection organisation			
A	National correspondent and participating institutes			
	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is there a national DCF website available?	No information provided	No	MS to provide information about the existence of the website. Otherwise, MS shall implement a DCF website until the end of current year
	Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?	NA	NA	MS to provide information about the existence of the website. Otherwise, MS shall implement a DCF website until the end of current year
	Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	NA (only one partner)	NA	No action needed
B	Regional and International coordination			
B1	Attendance of international meetings			
	Is Table II.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	NA	NA	No action needed
B2	Follow-up of regional and international recommendations and agreements			
	In Table II.B.2, are the relevant regional and international recommendations (RCM's/STECF/LM/Survey Planning Groups) listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described?	NA	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
III	Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector			
A	General description of the fishing sector			
	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
B	Economic variables			
	Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	SUPRA-REGION Mediterranean and Black Sea			
	Is Table III.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table III.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table III.B.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is respective data quality information given?	Response rate equal to zero for purse seiners >18 m (2 segments). MS explained low response rate.	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
B4	Actions to avoid deviations			
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
C	Biological metier related variables			
	Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea			
C1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is Table III.C.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No need for for several decimal places for landings and values.	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table III.C.4 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table III.C.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	Some inconsistencies : number of sampled trips of metier LLD_LPF_SWO greater than the total number of fishing trips carried out in 2014.	Yes	MS to clarify how many trips were achieved in Metier LLD_LPF_SWO
	Is Table III.C.6 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	NP gives preference to sampling at sea, but in the AR it is clear that most of the sampling work is done on shore. Why ?	Mostly	MS should ensure that they sample according to the planned targets in the NP.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Only 2 trips at sea were achieved from the planned 36 trips across the 3 trawling metiers.	Mostly	MS to provide an explanation on the significant under sampling of planned at sea trips for the 3 OTB metiers. The MS should endeavour to successfully get on board observers out on these fleets.
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	There is no clear explanation for the serious undersampling of the OTB metiers. Also for the small scale fisheries, the reson for undersampling at sea (vessels were too small to accept observers) is not acceptable.	Partly	MS should provide details of what actions are being taken to solve this on -going problem.
C2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes. Optimisation and quality control of sampling is still an ongoing work	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
C4	Actions to avoid deviations			
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	There is no clear explanation for the serious undersampling of the OTB metiers. Also for the small scale fisheries, the reson for undersampling at sea (vessels were too small to accept observers) is not acceptable.	Mostly	MS to provide an explanation on the significant under sampling of planned at sea trips for the 3 OTB metiers. The MS should endeavour to successfully get on board observers out on these fleets.
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	There is no clear explanation for the serious undersampling of the OTB metiers. Also for the small scale fisheries, the reason for undersampling at sea (vessels were too small to accept observers) is not acceptable.	Partly	MS should provide details of what actions are being taken to solve this on -going problem.



<b>Member State:</b>		<b>Malta</b>	
<b>AR year</b>			<b>2014</b>
<b>Version of the AR reviewed</b>		May 2015	
<b>Version of the NP proposal</b>		NP 2011-2013 amended for 2013 - March 2013	
		<b>EWG Answer</b>	
<b>Overall compliance</b>		<b>Mostly</b>	
		<b>EWG Comment</b>	<b>EWG judgement</b>
			<b>EWG - Action needed?</b>
<b>D</b>	<b>Recreational fisheries</b>		
		Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?	No action needed
	<b>Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea</b>		
		Is Table III.D.1 consistent with the AR guidelines?	MS is requested also to report the other two species (eel and sharks) in Table III.D.1
<b>D</b>	<b>D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes
		<b>D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes
<b>D</b>	<b>D4 Actions to avoid deviations</b>		
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Yes
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Yes
<b>E</b>	<b>Biological stock-related variables</b>		
		Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	No action needed
<b>E</b>	<b>E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
		Is Table III.E.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes
		Is Table III.E.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly
		Is Table III.E.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes
<b>E</b>	<b>E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes
<b>E</b>	<b>E4 Actions to avoid deviations</b>		
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Yes
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Yes
<b>F</b>	<b>Transversal variables</b>		
		Is Table III.F.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes
<b>F</b>	<b>F1 Capacity</b>		
		<b>F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes
		Are the deviations explained?	NA
		Are the deviations justified?	NA
		<b>F13 Actions to avoid deviations</b>	
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	NA
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	NA
<b>F</b>	<b>F2 Effort</b>		
		<b>F21 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes
		Are the deviations explained?	NA
		Are the deviations justified?	NA
		<b>F22 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes
		Are the deviations explained?	NA
		Are the deviations justified?	NA
<b>F</b>	<b>F23 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA
		Are the responsive actions described ?	NA
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA
<b>F</b>	<b>F24 Actions to avoid deviations</b>		
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	NA
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	NA
<b>F</b>	<b>F3 Landings</b>		
		<b>F31 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes
		Are the deviations explained?	NA
		Are the deviations justified?	NA
		<b>F32 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes
		Are the deviations explained?	NA
		Are the deviations justified?	NA
<b>F</b>	<b>F33 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA
		Are the responsive actions described ?	NA
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA
<b>F</b>	<b>F34 Actions to avoid deviations</b>		
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	NA
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	NA
<b>G</b>	<b>Research surveys at sea</b>		
		<b>G1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	





<b>Member State:</b>		<b>The Netherlands</b>	
<b>AR year</b>		<b>2014</b>	
<b>Version of the AR reviewed</b>		Version 2 (4 June 2015)	
<b>Version of the NP proposal</b>		Version 10 (31 Oct 2011)	
		<b>EWG Answer</b>	
<b>Overall compliance</b>		<b>Mostly</b>	
		<b>EWG Comment</b>	<b>EWG judgement</b>
			<b>EWG - Action needed?</b>
<b>I General framework</b>		Is Table I.A.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments
		Is Table I.A.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments
<b>II National data collection organisation</b>			
<b>A National correspondent and participating institutes</b>		Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	No comments
		Is there a national DCF website available?	No comments
		Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?	No comments
		Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	MS: "There were no formal meetings with minutes in 2014. However, informal contacts between the partners have been very frequent."
<b>B Regional and International coordination</b>			
<b>B1 Attendance of international meetings</b>		Is Table II.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments
		Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	No comments
<b>B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations and agreements</b>			
		In Table II.B.2, are the relevant regional and international recommendations (RCM's/STECF/LM/Survey Planning Groups) listed?	No comments
		Are the responsive actions described?	No comments
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments
<b>III Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector</b>			
<b>A General description of the fishing sector</b>		Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	No comments
<b>B Economic variables</b>		Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?	No comments
<b>SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea, Eastern Arctic, North Atlantic</b>			
		Is Table III.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Total number 739 differs from fleet register 848 (but is consistent with NP). Fleet segments should be presented already clustered. Single unclustered segments to be reported in table IIIB2.
		Is Table III.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	Asterisk should be used in column D, not F. Format is not in line with guidelines
			Clustered segments is not repored with an asterisk. Financial position is missing. Quality information not consistent with IIIB1 (e.g. FPO 12-18 response rate is 7% in table IIIB1, while it is 25%-29% in IIIB3)
<b>B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		Is Table III.B.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	The MS is requested to provide a new table, using the fleet register as target population. The text from the AR must be amended accordingly.
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly
		Are the deviations explained?	In the future, MS has to follow guidelines
		Are the deviations justified?	Mostly
<b>B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			MS has to clarify inconsistency in response rates between tables IIIB1 and IIIB3
		Is respective data quality information given?	Planned sample low compared to NP and response rates low for several segments.
		Are the deviations explained?	Mostly
		Are the deviations justified?	MS has to take actions to improve sample size and response rates
<b>B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments
<b>B4 Actions to avoid deviations</b>		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments
<b>SUPRA-REGION Other Fishing Regions</b>			
		Is Table III.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Vessels spent the majority of their time at sea in other areas have to be included in table III.B.1, even if data are not provided for confidentiality reasons.
		Is Table III.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No
		Is Table III.B.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	MS has to submit a new table.
<b>B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	Considering that no information is given on table IIIB1, we cannot judge if clustering is implemented or not
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No
		Are the deviations explained?	MS has to clarify this issue
		Are the deviations justified?	No information on data collection activities for vessels operating in other regions
<b>B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			No
		Is respective data quality information given?	MS has to submit a new table
		Are the deviations explained?	Data for other regions has to be collected, according to NP. No derogation exists.
		Are the deviations justified?	No
<b>B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	MS has to implement NP
		Are the responsive actions described?	Data for other regions has to be collected, according to NP. No derogation exists
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	The text is completely confusing. In paragraph IIIB it is said that no data has been collected, while in paragraph IIIB1, it is said that "Data from all pelagic vessels was collected including the vessels fishing in other regions."
<b>B4 Actions to avoid deviations</b>		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No
			MS has to clarify if data has been collected and if yes text should be amended accordingly
			Information reported in the text is not clear
			No
			MS has to provide information in the text
			Table IIIB3 does not include information on data quality. No information given on the text
			cannot judge - no information provided
			cannot judge - no information provided
			No
			MS has to provide information in the text
			No comments
			NA
			No action needed
			No comments
			NA
			No action needed
			No comments
			NA
			No action needed
			cannot judge - no information provided
			No
			MS has to provide information in the text







Member State:	The Netherlands	
	AR year	2014
	Version of the AR reviewed	Version 2 (4 June 2015)
	Version of the NP proposal	Version 10 (31 Oct 2011)
	EWG Answer	
Overall compliance	Mostly	

North Atlantic	E1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.1 consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.E.2 consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.E.3 consistent with AR guidelines? Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	EWG Comment	EWG judgement	EWG - Action needed?
				A very generalized action is described only for pelagic fisheries,. No other details are provided for other shortfalls.	Mostly	MS has to provide details on actions to avoid deviations for all shortfalls.
				No comment	Yes	No action needed
				No comment	Yes	No action needed
				No comment	Yes	No action needed
				No comment	Yes	No action needed
				Under sampling for Clupea harengus, and Argentina spp. And slight undersampling for Scombrus scombrus. No planned sampling numbers provided in Table III.E.3 of the AR for Argentia spp.in areas IV and VIId (no planned levels were included in the NP either).	Mostly	No action needed
				information is provided for Argentine species and for Scombrus scombrus. However only 40% of targets were achieved for Clupea harengus and no detailed information is provided on why?	Partly	MS has to clearly explain the deviations from the planned targets.
				information is provided for Argentine species and for Scombrus scombrus. However only 40% of targets were achieved for Clupea harengus and no detailed information is provided on why?	Partly	MS to has clearly explain the deviations from the planned targets.
				information is provided for Argentine species and for Scombrus scombrus. However only 40% of targets were achieved for Clupea harengus and no detailed information is provided on why?	Partly	MS has to clearly explain the deviations from the planned targets.
				information is provided for Argentine species and for Scombrus scombrus. However only 40% of targets were achieved for Clupea harengus and no detailed information is provided on why?	Partly	MS has to clearly explain the deviations from the planned targets.
				information is provided for Argentine species and for Scombrus scombrus. However only 40% of targets were achieved for Clupea harengus and no detailed information is provided on why?	Partly	MS has to clearly explain the deviations from the planned targets.
				information is provided for Argentine species and for Scombrus scombrus. However only 40% of targets were achieved for Clupea harengus and no detailed information is provided on why?	Partly	MS has to clearly explain the deviations from the planned targets.

Other areas	E1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.1 consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.E.2 consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.E.3 consistent with AR guidelines? Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?						
			Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?						
				The actions to avoid deviations are a copy and paste from the North Sea and Eastern Arctic region, and further information Is required.	Partly	MS has to provide details on actions to avoid deviations for all shortfalls.			
				The actions to avoid deviations are a copy and paste from the North Sea and Eastern Arctic region, and further information Is required.	Partly	MS has to provide details on actions to avoid deviations for all shortfalls.			
				No comment	Yes	No action needed			
				No comment	Yes	No action needed			
				No comment	Yes	No action needed			
				No comment	Yes	No action needed			
				Mostly over sampling compared to targets in the NP	Yes	No action needed			
				No comment	Yes	No action needed			
				No comment	Yes	No action needed			
			F	E2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	Are the deviations explained?			
						Are the deviations justified?			
							No quality assessment made.	No	MS needs to provide information with text explaining sampling where applicable.
	No quality assessment made.	NA				MS needs to provide information with text explaining sampling where applicable.			
	No comments	NA				No action needed			
	No comments	NA				No action needed			
Transversal variables									
	Is Table III.F.1 consistent with AR guidelines?					Reference year should be 2014 instead of 2013.	Yes	MS should provide appropriate reference year in the future	
F	F1	Capacity F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F13 Actions to avoid deviations Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ? Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?							
							No comments	Yes	No action needed
							No comments	Yes	No action needed
							No comments	NA	No action needed
							No comments	NA	No action needed
							No comments	NA	No action needed
				No comments	NA	No action needed			
				No comments	NA	No action needed			
				No comments	NA	No action needed			
				No comments	NA	No action needed			
				No comments	NA	No action needed			
				No comments	NA	No action needed			
				No comments	NA	No action needed			
				No comments	NA	No action needed			



Member State:		The Netherlands				
AR year		2014				
Version of the AR reviewed		Version 2 (4 June 2015)				
Version of the NP proposal		Version 10 (31 Oct 2011)				
		EWG Answer				
Overall compliance		Mostly				
		EWG Comment	EWG judgement			
		EWG - Action needed?				
G	F32	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal					
		Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
	F33	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations				
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
		Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
	F34	Actions to avoid deviations				
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
Research surveys at sea						
G1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal					
	Is Table III.G.1 consistent with AR guidelines?					
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?					
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?					
	Are the deviations explained?					
	Are the deviations justified?					
	Is a map of each survey with achieved sampling activities provided?					
	G2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
		Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?				
		Are the deviations explained?				
		Are the deviations justified?				
	G4	Actions to avoid deviations				
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?				
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?						
Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry						
A	Collection of data concerning the aquaculture					
	Is Table IV.A.1 consistent with AR guidelines					
	Is Table IV.A.2 consistent with AR guidelines?					
	Is Table IV.A.3 consistent with AR guidelines?					
	A1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?				
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?					
	Are the deviations explained?					
	A2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
		Is respective data quality information given?				
Are the deviations explained?						
A3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations					
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?					
	Are the responsive actions described ?					
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?					
A4	Actions to avoid deviations					
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?					
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?					
Collection of data concerning the processing industry						
B1	Is Table IV.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?					
	Is Table IV.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?					
	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal					
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?					
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?					
	Are the deviations explained?					
	Are the deviations justified?					
	B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
		Is respective data quality information given?				
		Are the deviations explained?				
		Are the deviations justified?				
	B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations				
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?				
		Are the responsive actions described ?				
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?				
B4	Actions to avoid deviations					
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?					
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?					
Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem						

**Member State:**

The Netherlands	
AR year	2014
Version of the AR reviewed	Version 2 (4 June 2015)
Version of the NP proposal	Version 10 (31 Oct 2011)
	EWG Answer
Overall compliance	Mostly

	EWG Comment	EWG judgement	EWG - Action needed?
1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
Is Table V.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Other regions missing, e.g. CECAF	Mostly	MS is requested to add other areas in Table V.1
2 Actions to avoid deviations			
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described?	No comments	NA	No action needed
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
<b>VI Module for management and use of the data</b>			
1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
Is Table VI.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
2 Actions to avoid deviations			
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
<b>VII Follow-up of STECF recommendation</b> (-> dealt with under II.B.2)			
<b>VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations</b>			
Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comments	Yes	no action needed
<b>IX Comments, suggestions and reflections</b>			
Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	No comments	Yes	no action needed
<b>X References</b>			
Is there a complete list of references?	No comments	Yes	no action needed
<b>XI Annexes</b>			
Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	No comments	Yes	no action needed
Are relevant bilateral and/or multilateral agreements included?	No comments	Yes	no action needed



<b>Member State:</b>	<b>Poland</b>
<b>AR year</b>	<b>2014</b>
<b>Version of the AR reviewed</b>	31 May 2015
<b>Version of the NP proposal</b>	22 Oct 2011
	<b>EWG Answer</b>
<b>Overall compliance</b>	<b>YES</b>

		<b>EWG Comment</b>	<b>EWG judgement</b>	<b>EWG - Action needed?</b>
<b>I General framework</b>	Is Table I.A.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table I.A.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<b>II National data collection organisation</b>				
<b>A National correspondent and participating institutes</b>	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is there a national DCF website available?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	No comments	Yes	For the future MS should provide minutes of the national coordination meetings.
<b>B Regional and International coordination</b>				
<b>B1 Attendance of international meetings</b>	Is Table II.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	NA	NA	No action needed
<b>B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations and agreements</b>	In Table II.B.2, are the relevant regional and international recommendations (RCM's/STECF/LM/Survey Planning Groups) listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<b>III Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector</b>				
<b>A General description of the fishing sector</b>	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
<b>B Economic variables</b>				
<b>SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea, Eastern Arctic, North Atlantic</b>				
<b>B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	Is Table III.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table III.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table III.B.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	Achieved sample rate should be reported as a percentage (cannot be higher than 100% in case of Census)	Yes	MS is asked to correct figures on achieved sample rate and resubmit table III.B.3
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comment	NA	No action needed
	Is respective data quality information given?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comment	NA	No action needed
<b>B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	Are the deviations justified?	No comment	NA	No action needed
<b>B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described?	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.	NA	No action needed
<b>B4 Actions to avoid deviations</b>	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed
<b>SUPRA-REGION Other Fishing Regions</b>				
<b>B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	Is Table III.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table III.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table III.B.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comment	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comment	NA	No action needed
	Is respective data quality information given?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comment	NA	No action needed
<b>B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	Are the deviations justified?	No comment	NA	No action needed
<b>B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comment	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described?	No comment	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comment	NA	No action needed

Member State:	Poland
AR year	2014
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2015
Version of the NP proposal	22 Oct 2011
	EWG Answer
Overall compliance	YES

		EWG Comment	EWG judgement	EWG - Action needed?	
B4	Actions to avoid deviations				
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comment	NA	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comment	NA	No action needed
C	Biological metier related variables				
	Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?				
Baltic	C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
		Is Table III.C.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed
		Is Table III.C.4 consistent with AR guidelines?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed
		Is Table III.C.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed
		Is Table III.C.6 consistent with AR guidelines?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed
			No Comment	Yes	No action needed
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	7 of the planned 22 metiers were under sampled, or not sampled at all. No sampling was achieved for OTM_SPF_32-104 métier targeting Clupea harengus in SD 25-32, and LLS_DEF_0_0_0 metier.	Mostly	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed
		C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are the deviations explained?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed
		C4 Actions to avoid deviations			
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed		
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed		
North Sea and East Arctic					
C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal					
	Is Table III.C.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed	
	Is Table III.C.4 consistent with AR guidelines?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed	
	Is Table III.C.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed	
	Is Table III.C.6 consistent with AR guidelines?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed	
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed	
		No Comment	Yes	No action needed	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed	
	Are the deviations explained?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed	
	Are the deviations justified?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed	
	C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
	Are the deviations explained?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed	
	Are the deviations justified?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed	
	C4 Actions to avoid deviations				
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed		
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed		
Other regions					
C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal					
	Is Table III.C.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed	
	Is Table III.C.4 consistent with AR guidelines?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed	
	Is Table III.C.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed	
	Is Table III.C.6 consistent with AR guidelines?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed	
		Yes: Sampling in 2014 was arranged through agreed joint sampling programme. Following RCM LDF 2011 recommendation, Poland signed to “Multi-lateral agreement between Germany, Latvia, Lithuania, The Netherlands and Poland for biological data collection of pelagic fisheries in CECAF waters”. There were no fishing activities in the SPRMFO area by Polish vessels in 2014.	Yes	No action needed	
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed	
	Are the deviations explained?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed	
	Are the deviations justified?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed	
	C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
	Are the deviations explained?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed	
	Are the deviations justified?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed	
	C4 Actions to avoid deviations				
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed		
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No Comment	Yes	No action needed		
D Recreational fisheries					
	Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Is Table III.D.1 consistent with the AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
Baltic					
D1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal				

Member State:	Poland
AR year	2014
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2015
Version of the NP proposal	22 Oct 2011
	EWG Answer
Overall compliance	YES

		EWG Comment	EWG judgement	EWG - Action needed?
D2	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed
D4	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed
E	Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
Baltic				
E1	Is Table III.E.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table III.E.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table III.E.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Some under and over sampling reported	Mostly	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
E2	Are the deviations explained?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
E4	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
North Sea ans Eastern arctic				
E1	Is Table III.E.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table III.E.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table III.E.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
E2	Are the deviations explained?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
E4	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
Other regions				
E1	Is Table III.E.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table III.E.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table III.E.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
E2	Are the deviations explained?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
E4	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
F				
F1	Is Table III.F.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Reference year should be 2014 instead of 2013.	Yes	MS should provide appropriate reference year in the future
F11	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed



<b>Member State:</b>	<b>Poland</b>	
<b>AR year</b>		<b>2014</b>
<b>Version of the AR reviewed</b>		31 May 2015
<b>Version of the NP proposal</b>		22 Oct 2011
	<b>EWG Answer</b>	
<b>Overall compliance</b>	<b>YES</b>	

		<b>EWG Comment</b>	<b>EWG judgement</b>	<b>EWG - Action needed?</b>
	<a href="#">Are the deviations justified?</a>	No comments	NA	No action needed
<b>F13</b>	Actions to avoid deviations			
	<a href="#">Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?</a>	No comments	NA	No action needed
	<a href="#">Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?</a>	No comments	NA	No action needed
<b>F2</b>	<b>Effort</b>			
<b>F21</b>	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	<a href="#">Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?</a>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	<a href="#">Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?</a>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	<a href="#">Are the deviations explained?</a>	No comments	NA	No action needed
	<a href="#">Are the deviations justified?</a>	No comments	NA	No action needed
<b>F22</b>	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	<a href="#">Is respective data quality information given?</a>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	<a href="#">Are the deviations explained?</a>	No comments	NA	No action needed
	<a href="#">Are the deviations justified?</a>	No comments	NA	No action needed
<b>F23</b>	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
	<a href="#">Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?</a>	No comments	NA	No action needed
	<a href="#">Are the responsive actions described ?</a>	No comments	NA	No action needed
	<a href="#">Are the responsive actions acceptable?</a>	No comments	NA	No action needed
<b>F24</b>	Actions to avoid deviations			
	<a href="#">Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?</a>	No comments	NA	No action needed
	<a href="#">Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?</a>	No comments	NA	No action needed
<b>F3</b>	<b>Landings</b>			
<b>F31</b>	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	<a href="#">Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?</a>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	<a href="#">Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?</a>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	<a href="#">Are the deviations explained?</a>	No comments	NA	No action needed
	<a href="#">Are the deviations justified?</a>	No comments	NA	No action needed
<b>F32</b>	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	<a href="#">Is respective data quality information given?</a>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	<a href="#">Are the deviations explained?</a>	No comments	NA	No action needed
	<a href="#">Are the deviations justified?</a>	No comments	NA	No action needed
<b>F33</b>	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
	<a href="#">Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?</a>	No comments	NA	No action needed
	<a href="#">Are the responsive actions described ?</a>	No comments	NA	No action needed
	<a href="#">Are the responsive actions acceptable?</a>	No comments	NA	No action needed
<b>F34</b>	Actions to avoid deviations			
	<a href="#">Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?</a>	No comments	NA	No action needed
	<a href="#">Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?</a>	No comments	NA	No action needed
<b>G</b>	<b>Research surveys at sea</b>			
<b>G1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	<a href="#">Is Table III.G.1 consistent with AR guidelines?</a>	No comments	Yes	No action required
	<a href="#">Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?</a>	No comments	Yes	No action required
	<a href="#">Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?</a>	Slightly different planned targets given in AR and NP: BITS Q1: AR 51 hauls, NP 35 hauls; BITS Q4: AR 33 hauls, NP 31 hauls; BIAS: AR 34 hauls, NP 31 hauls, AR 830 Echo Nm, NP 1000 Echo Nm. NP targets were, however, reached as well.	Yes	No action required
	<a href="#">Are the deviations explained?</a>	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action required
	<a href="#">Are the deviations justified?</a>	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action required
	<a href="#">Is a map of each survey with achieved sampling activities provided?</a>	No comments	Yes	No action required
<b>G2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	<a href="#">Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?</a>	No comments	Yes	No action required
	<a href="#">Are the deviations explained?</a>	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action required
	<a href="#">Are the deviations justified?</a>	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action required
<b>G4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid deviations</b>			
	<a href="#">Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?</a>	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action required
	<a href="#">Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?</a>	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action required
<b>IV</b>	<b>Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry</b>			
<b>A</b>	<b>Collection of data concerning the aquaculture</b>			
	<a href="#">Is Table IV.A.1 consistent with AR guidelines</a>	Template should not be changed, cells should not be deleted	Yes	Please submit a complete table with the next Annual Report.
	<a href="#">Is Table IV.A.2 consistent with AR guidelines?</a>	No comment	Yes	
	<a href="#">Is Table IV.A.3 consistent with AR guidelines?</a>	Two variables (repair and maintenance cost, financial costs net) are missing.	Mostly	MS should resubmit the table IV.A.3 including the missing variables and the respective entries.
<b>A1</b>	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			



Member State:		Poland		
AR year		2014		
Version of the AR reviewed		31 May 2015		
Version of the NP proposal		22 Oct 2011		
		EWG Answer		
Overall compliance		YES		
		EWG Comment	EWG judgement	EWG - Action needed?
Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?		No comment	Yes	No action needed
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		No comment	Yes	No action needed
Are the deviations explained?		No comment	NA	No action needed
Are the deviations justified?		No comment	NA	No action needed
A2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
Is respective data quality information given?		No comment	Yes	No action needed
Are the deviations explained?		No comment	NA	No action needed
Are the deviations justified?		No comment	NA	No action needed
A3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		No comment	NA	No action needed
Are the responsive actions described ?		No comment	NA	No action needed
Are the responsive actions acceptable?		No comment	NA	No action needed
A4	Actions to avoid deviations			
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?		No comment	NA	No action needed
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?		No comment	NA	No action needed
B	Collection of data concerning the processing industry			
Is Table IV.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?		No comment	Yes	No action needed
		AR text mentions 193 processing plants, table IV.B.1 reports 187 plants. The source for the number of enterprises is mentioned to be a register (table IV.B.2 and AR text), the response rate of 85% is not clear for this item.	Mostly	MS is asked to clarify the differences in the population and to explain the response rate for the information on the number of enterprises. If entries have to be corrected, MS should resubmit the table IV.B.1 and IV.B.2
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?		No comment	Yes	No action needed
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		No comment	Yes	No action needed
Are the deviations explained?		No comment	NA	No action needed
Are the deviations justified?		No comment	NA	No action needed
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
Is respective data quality information given?		No comment	Yes	No action needed
Are the deviations explained?		No comment	NA	No action needed
Are the deviations justified?		No comment	NA	No action needed
B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		No comment	NA	No action needed
Are the responsive actions described ?		No comment	NA	No action needed
Are the responsive actions acceptable?		No comment	NA	No action needed
B4	Actions to avoid deviations			
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?		No comment	Yes	No action needed
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?		No comment	Yes	No action needed
V	Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem			
1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
Is Table V.1 consistent with AR guidelines?		No comments	Yes	No action required
2 Actions to avoid deviations				
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described?		Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action required
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?		Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action required
VI	Module for management and use of the data			
1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
Is Table VI.1 consistent with AR guidelines?		No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		No comments	Yes	No action needed
Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?		No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the deviations explained?		NA	NA	No action needed
Are the deviations justified?		NA	NA	No action needed
2 Actions to avoid deviations				
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?		NA	NA	No action needed
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?		NA	NA	No action needed
		No comment	Yes	No action needed
VII	Follow-up of STECF recomn (-> dealt with under II.B.2)			
VIII	List of acronyms and abbreviations			
Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?		No comment	Yes	No action needed
IX	Comments, suggestions and reflections			
Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?		No comment	NA	No action needed
X	References			
Is there a complete list of references?		No comment	Yes	No action needed
XI	Annexes			
Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?		No comment	Yes	No action needed

Member State:	Poland
AR year	2014
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2015
Version of the NP proposal	22 Oct 2011
EWG Answer	
Overall compliance	YES

	EWG Comment	EWG judgement	EWG - Action needed?
Are relevant bilateral and/or multilateral agreements included?	No comment	Yes	No action needed

<b>Member State:</b>		<b>Portugal</b>	
<b>AR year</b>			<b>2014</b>
<b>Version of the AR reviewed</b>			28 May 2015
<b>Version of the NP proposal</b>			Sep 2010?
		<b>EWG Answer</b>	
<b>Overall compliance</b>		<b>Mostly</b>	
		<b>EWG Comment</b>	<b>EWG judgement</b>
			<b>EWG - Action needed?</b>
<b>I General framework</b>		Is Table I.A.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments
			Yes
			No action needed
		Is Table I.A.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	NA
			NA
			MS to clarify if agreement with Spain in NAFO is still valid.
<b>II National data collection organisation</b>			
<b>A National correspondent and participating institutes</b>		Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	No comments
			Yes
			No action needed
		Is there a national DCF website available?	No comments
			Yes
			No action needed
		Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?	No comments
			Yes
			No action needed
		Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	Wrong information (2013) in AR text provided
			No
			For the future MS should provide minutes of the national coordination meetings.
<b>B Regional and International coordination</b>			
<b>B1 Attendance of international meetings</b>		Is Table II.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments
			Yes
			No action needed
		Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	NA
			NA
			No action needed
<b>B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations and agreements</b>		In Table II.B.2, are the relevant regional and international recommendations (RCM's/STECF/LM/Survey Planning Groups) listed?	No comments
			Yes
			No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	No comments
			Yes
			No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments
			Yes
			No action needed
<b>III Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector</b>			
<b>A General description of the fishing sector</b>		Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	No comment
			Yes
			No action needed
		As information in the respective AR tables is given, providing no extra section for Med supra-region in AR text is acceptable.	
			Yes
			MS is asked to provide information in future AR if data for the vessels operating in the Med. Sea is reported separately or merged with other segments.
<b>B Economic variables</b>		Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?	
<b>SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea, Eastern Arctic, North Atlantic</b>			
		Is Table III.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Planned sample no. In case of Passive gears: using hooks 0-10 m., and Active gears - purse seiners 0-10 exceeds population twofold leading to planned sample rate of 200%, and for Passive gears: using hooks 10-12 m. and 12-18m sample rate is 146% and 197%, respectively. For several segments the planned sample rate is 100%, which corresponds to a Census and not to a probability sampling scheme. NP and AR years are missing. We may have a significant discrepancy with the population in the fleet register.
			Mostly
			MS is asked to clarify and resubmit table III.B.1.
		Is Table III.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	Numbers in table III.B.1 do not match with numbers in table III.B.2 (values too low for the three clustered segments of the supra-region in table III.B.2). NP years and AR year should be provided
			Partly
			MS is asked to clarify and resubmit table III.B.2.
		Is Table III.B.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	Financial position is missing.
			Mostly
			MS is asked to clarify and resubmit table III.B.3.
<b>B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	MS switched from census to random sampling, which appears reasonable given the achieved sampling rates. However it is not clear what will be the impact on time series. There is a reference to a "revision process" that is still under implementation.
			Mostly
			MS is asked to check the impact of the new methodology on time series and report it in next years AR.
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comment
			Yes
			No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comment
			Yes
			No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comment
			Yes
			No action needed
<b>B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
		Is respective data quality information given?	The impact of the new methodology on data quality has not been fully assed.
			Mostly
			MS is asked to check the impact of the new methodology on time series and report it in next years AR.
		Are the deviations explained?	No comment
			Yes
			No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comment
			Yes
			No action needed
<b>B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comment
			NA
			No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	No comment
			NA
			No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comment
			NA
			No action needed
<b>B4 Actions to avoid deviations</b>			
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comment
			Yes
			No action needed
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comment
			Yes
			No action needed
<b>SUPRA-REGION Mediterranean and Black Sea</b>			
		Is Table III.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	
			Yes
			MS is asked to provide information in future AR if data for the vessels operating in the Med. Sea is reported separately or merged with other segments.
		Is Table III.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	not applicable; no clustering in the Mediterranean region
			Yes
			No action needed
		Is Table III.B.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	Financial position is missing.
			Yes
			No action needed
<b>B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	
			Yes
			No action needed
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Not applicable
			Yes
			No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	Not applicable
			Yes
			No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	Not applicable
			Yes
			No action needed
<b>B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
		Is respective data quality information given?	
			Yes
			No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	Not applicable
			Yes
			No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	Not applicable
			Yes
			No action needed
<b>B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	
			Yes
			No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	
			Yes
			No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	
			Yes
			No action needed
<b>B4 Actions to avoid deviations</b>			
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	
			Yes
			No action needed
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	
			Yes
			No action needed
<b>SUPRA-REGION Other Fishing Regions</b>			



Member State:		Portugal		
		AR year	2014	
		Version of the AR reviewed	28 May 2015	
		Version of the NP proposal	Sep 2010?	
		EWG Answer		
Overall compliance		Mostly		
		EWG Comment	EWG judgement	EWG - Action needed?
Is Table III.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?		Planned sample no. In case of Passive gears - vessels using hooks 24-40 exceeds population threefold leading to planned sample rate of 300%. For several segments the planned sample rate is 100%, which corresponds to a Census and not to a probability sampling scheme. NP and AR years are missing.We may have a significant discrepancy with the population in the fleet register.	Mostly	MS is asked to clarify and resubmit table III.B.1.
Is Table III.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?		Segment Vessels using polyvalent active gears only 18-< 24 m*, other regions reported in table III.B.2 but are not clustered with any other segment.	Partly	MS is asked to clarify and resubmit table III.B.2.
Is Table III.B.3 consistent with AR guidelines?		NP years and AR year should be provided	Mostly	MS is asked to clarify and resubmit table III.B.3.
		Financial position is missing.		
MS switched from census to random sampling, which appears reasonable given the achieved sampling rates. However it is not clear what will be the impact on time series. There is a reference to a "revision process" that is still under implementation.		Mostly		MS is asked to check the impact of the new methodology on time series and report it in next years AR.
No comment		Yes		No action needed
No comment		Yes		No action needed
No comment		Yes		No action needed
The impact of the new methodology on data quality has not been fully assed.		Mostly		MS is asked to check the impact of the new methodology on time series and report it in next years AR.
No comment		Yes		No action needed
No comment		Yes		No action needed
Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.		NA		No action needed
Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.		NA		No action needed
Not Applicable, no relevant recommendations were made.		NA		No action needed
No comment		Yes		No action needed
No comment		Yes		No action needed
Region' column should be filled in according to the guidelines. CECAF, ICCAT and IOTC are not regions, but are fishing grounds, and should appear only in Col E of table IIIC1. Regions is 'Other Regions'		Yes.		next year and onwards MS should comply with the guidelines



Member State:	Portugal					
	AR year	2014				
	Version of the AR reviewed	28 May 2015				
	Version of the NP proposal	Sep 2010?				
		EWG Answer				
	Overall compliance	Mostly				
CECAF	C4	Actions to avoid deviations	Are the deviations explained?			
			Are the deviations justified?			
			Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?			
			Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?			
	C1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is Table III.C.1 consistent with AR guidelines?			
			Is Table III.C.4 consistent with AR guidelines?			
			Is Table III.C.3 consistent with AR guidelines?			
			Is Table III.C.6 consistent with AR guidelines?			
			Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?			
	C2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?			
			Are the deviations explained?			
			Are the deviations justified?			
			Are the deviations explained?			
			Are the deviations justified?			
C4	Actions to avoid deviations	Are the deviations explained?				
		Are the deviations justified?				
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?				
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?				
D	Recreational fisheries	Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?				
		Is Table III.D.1 consistent with the AR guidelines?				
North Atlantic	D1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?			
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?			
			Are the deviations explained?			
			Are the deviations justified?			
	D2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Are the deviations explained?			
			Are the deviations justified?			
	D4	Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?			
			Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?			
	E	Biological stock-related variables	Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?			
North Sea & Eastern Arctic	E1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is Table III.E.1 consistent with AR guidelines?			
			Is Table III.E.2 consistent with AR guidelines?			
			Is Table III.E.3 consistent with AR guidelines?			
			Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?			
	E2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?			
			Are the deviations explained?			
			Are the deviations justified?			
	E4	Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?			
			Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?			
	North Atlantic	E1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is Table III.E.1 consistent with AR guidelines?		
				Is Table III.E.2 consistent with AR guidelines?		
Is Table III.E.3 consistent with AR guidelines?						
Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?						
E2		Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?			
			Are the deviations explained?			
			Are the deviations justified?			
E4		Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?			
			Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?			
Other Regions		E1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is Table III.E.1 consistent with AR guidelines?		
				Is Table III.E.2 consistent with AR guidelines?		
	Is Table III.E.3 consistent with AR guidelines?					
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?					
	E2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?			
			Are the deviations explained?			
			Are the deviations justified?			
	E4	Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?			
			Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?			

<b>Member State:</b>		<b>Portugal</b>	
<b>AR year</b>		<b>2014</b>	
<b>Version of the AR reviewed</b>		28 May 2015	
<b>Version of the NP proposal</b>		Sep 2010?	
		<b>EWG Answer</b>	
<b>Overall compliance</b>		<b>Mostly</b>	
		<b>EWG Comment</b>	<b>EWG judgement</b>
			<b>EWG - Action needed?</b>
F	<b>E2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	
		Are the deviations explained?	no comment
		Are the deviations justified?	no comment
	<b>E4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid deviations</b>	
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	no comment
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	no comment
	<b>Transversal variables</b>		
		Is Table III.F.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments
	<b>F1</b>	<b>Capacity</b>	
	<b>F11</b>	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments
	<b>F13</b>	Actions to avoid deviations	
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments
	<b>F2</b>	<b>Effort</b>	
	<b>F21</b>	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
			For vessels < 10 m, effort data are collected through sales notes. In the text it is explained that this allows the estimation of "effort days", but no information is given on other effort variables (like for instance Hours fished, Soaking Time, Number of hooks)
			Mostly
			MS should provide a clear description of the estimation procedure for effort variables for vesselsl <10m.
			For vessels < 10 m, effort data are collected through sales notes. In the text it is explained that this allows the estimation of "effort days", but no information is given on other effort variables (like for instance Hours fished, Soaking Time, Number of hooks)
			Mostly
			MS should provide a clear description of the estimation procedure for effort variables for vesselsl <10m.
			No comments
			NA
			No action needed
			No comments
			NA
			No action needed
	<b>F22</b>	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
		Is respective data quality information given?	No comments
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments
	<b>F23</b>	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments
		Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments
	<b>F24</b>	Actions to avoid deviations	
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments
	<b>F3</b>	<b>Landings</b>	
	<b>F31</b>	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments
	<b>F32</b>	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
		Is respective data quality information given?	No comments
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments
	<b>F33</b>	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments
		Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments
	<b>F34</b>	Actions to avoid deviations	
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments
G	<b>Research surveys at sea</b>		
	<b>G1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	
		Is Table III.G.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments
			Minor editorial issue: Captions of Figs. III.G.1(A) and III.G.1(B) refer to MEGS, while they should refer to Sardine DEPM.
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes
		Is a map of each survey with achieved sampling activities provided?	Yes
	<b>G2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	
		Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	No comments
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments
	<b>G4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid deviations</b>	
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments
IV	<b>Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry</b>		
	<b>A</b>	<b>Collection of data concerning the aquaculture</b>	
			Clams are not sampled according table, but according NP and IV.A.2 it is the major segment in terms of population. Species namse in Latin shall be indicated in any segment aquaculture exists.
		Is Table IV.A.1 consistent with AR guidelines	Partly
			MS needs to clarify and resubmit table IV.A.1.
			Quality data for major segments (bottom)accounting for most of population is not provided. It is evident from text that data was collected.
		Is Table IV.A.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly
			MS needs to clarify the issue and to resubmit the Aquaculture Module, including text and tables.
		Is Table IV.A.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes
			For the next submission figures should be given in percentages.
A1		Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comment
			Partly, as clam data collection is foreseen in the NP tables.
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly





<b>Member State:</b>		<b>Romania</b>	
<b>AR year</b>		<b>2014</b>	
<b>Version of the AR reviewed</b>		May 2015	
<b>Version of the NP proposal</b>		NP 2011-2013 - version 2010	
		<b>EWG Answer</b>	
<b>Overall compliance</b>		<b>Mostly</b>	
		<b>EWG Comment</b>	<b>EWG judgement</b> <b>EWG - Action needed?</b>
<b>I General framework</b>		No comments	Yes No action needed
Is Table I.A.1 consistent with AR guidelines?		NA	NA No action needed
<b>II National data collection organisation</b>			
<b>A National correspondent and participating institutes</b>			
Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?		No comments	Yes No action needed
Is there a national DCF website available?		No information provided	No MS to provide information about the existence of the website. Otherwise, MS shall implement a DCF website until the end of current year
Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?		NA	NA MS to provide information about the existence of the website. Otherwise, MS shall implement a DCF website until the end of current year
Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?		No comments	No MS to provide the information on the national coordinnation meetings. For the future MS should provide minutes of the national coordination meetings.
<b>B Regional and International coordination</b>			
<b>B1 Attendance of international meetings</b>			
Is Table II.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?		No comments	Yes No action needed
Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?		NA	NA No action needed
<b>B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations and agreements</b>			
In Table II.B.2, are the relevant regional and international recommendations (RCM's/STECF/LM/Survey Planning Groups) listed?		Only 2013 recommendations relevant, should only be in Table II.B.2, not in AR text	Yes No action needed
Are the responsive actions described?		No comments	Yes MS shoud in the future report in answer only to recomendations to the country.
Are the responsive actions acceptable?		No comments	Yes MS shoud in the future report in answer only to recomendations to the country.
<b>III Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector</b>			
<b>A General description of the fishing sector</b>			
Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?		No comments	Yes No action needed
<b>B Economic variables</b>		No comment	Yes No action needed
Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?			
<b>SUPRA-REGION Mediterranean and Black Sea</b>			
Is Table III.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?		Reference year should be 2013. Total no of vessels may differ grossly from fleet register. 30 Beam Trawlers are not listed in NP nor can be found in fleet register (but are also mentioned in AR text). Extra lines for sums should not be introduced.	Mostly MS is asked to clarify potentail difference between number of vessels reported and number of vessels in fleet register. Also, the presence of 30 beam trawlers in the AR that do not appear in the NP or fleet register. MS should not add extra lines for sums in future AR.
Is Table III.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?		Reference year should be 2013. Report beam trawlers 6-12m, as an independent fleet segment, and not clustered with beam trawlers 12-18 and 24-40m. Financial position missing.	Mostly MS should resubmit correct table and report data accordingly.
Is Table III.B.3 consistent with AR guidelines?		Response rates cannot be lower than achieved sample rate.	Mostly MS asked to clarify missing variable and to resubmit correct table.
<b>B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?		Missing information on clustering	Mostly MS is asked to provide information on clustering
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		No comment	Yes No action needed
Are the deviations explained?		No comment	NA No action needed
Are the deviations justified?		No comment	NA No action needed
<b>B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
Is respective data quality information given?		Response rates cannot be lower than achieved sample rate.	Mostly MS asked to clarify missing variable and to resubmit correct table.
Are the deviations explained?		No comment	Yes No action needed
Are the deviations justified?		No comment	Yes No action needed
<b>B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		No comment	Yes No action needed
Are the responsive actions described?		No comment	Yes No action needed
Are the responsive actions acceptable?		No comment	Yes No action needed
<b>B4 Actions to avoid deviations</b>			
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?		No comment	Yes No action needed
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?		No comment	Yes No action needed
<b>C Biological metier related variables</b>			
Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?		No comment	Yes No action needed
<b>Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea</b>			
<b>C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
Is Table III.C.1 consistent with AR guidelines?		Few metier identified in table III.C1 for sampling are actually not sampled (table III.C.3). MS should clearly indicate which metiers have been selected through the ranking system, indicating also for which of the three parameters considered (i.e. landing, values and effort). If any of the cited metier have been merged MS should correct columns O and P (the latter one should be fill with the name of the new metier in case it has been merged). MS should check the discrepancies between the name of the metier reported in the tables and the ones reported in the text of the AR.	Mostly MS is requested to resubmit the AR with a fulfilled set of tables, including revised table III.C.1, and if relevant, to amend the text accordingly. MS to clarify the meening of metier "Divers".
Is Table III.C.4 consistent with AR guidelines?		MS should not change the formula in the column (column P should report correctly the Planned total no. trips to be sampled by MS (N+O)). It is not clearly understandable the planned numbers of trips.	Mostly MS is requested to resubmit the AR with a fulfilled set of tables, including revised table III.C.4, and if relevant, to amend the text accordingly.



<b>Member State:</b>	<b>Romania</b>
<b>AR year</b>	<b>2014</b>
<b>Version of the AR reviewed</b>	May 2015
<b>Version of the NP proposal</b>	NP 2011-2013 - version 2010
	<b>EWG Answer</b>
<b>Overall compliance</b>	<b>Mostly</b>

		EWG Comment	EWG judgement	EWG - Action needed?
	Is Table III.C.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	Table III.C.3 not consistant eith table III.C.1. MS should not change formulas in AR tables. Achieved no. of sampled fishing trips at sea and Achieved no. Of sampled fishing trips on-shore concerning the same metier must be reported in the same line.	Yes	Next year and onwards MS is asked submit AR tables without changing table formats and formulas.
	Is Table III.C.6 consistent with AR guidelines?	Metier do not correspond with the ones reported in table III.C.3 and III.C.I. Formulas have been deleted in column N. Total number of fish achieved (column N) do not correspond with the real number if achieved data coming from the retained catches (column L), unsorted catches (column K) and discards (column M) are considered. Metier TBB_DEF_50-100_0_0 appears to be sampled (table III.C.3) but has no achievements on length sampling (table III.C.6). MS must remove colors from cells before AR submission. The number of species sampled raises questions about how concurrent sampling is beinh applied.	Partly	MS is requested to resubmit the AR with a fulfilled set of tables, including revised table III.C.6, and if relevant, to amend the text accordingly. MS to clarify how concurrent sampling is being applied.
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	Sampling scheme not consistent with NP but a clear justification is given in text report (page 30)	Mostly	No action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Planned targets are mostly achieved, except for OTM_MPD on shore (only 8 trips sampled vs 40 planned).	Mostly	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No explanation on deviations met for OTM_MPD (explanation is given further in sub-section IIIC4 (Actions to avoid shortfalls). AR text mentions that length sampling was focused only on 7 species. No explanation about metier TBB_DEF for which achieved length sampling by meier and species is not reported.	Mostly	MS to give explanation on species focused sampling and for the absence of TBB_DEF length sampling by species in table III.C.6. For next year and onwards, MS to provide all the explanations in the right sub-section.
	Are the deviations justified?	The justifications given are acceptable, but some deviations need to be justified species focused and TBB_DEF)	Mostly	MS to give explanation on species focused sampling and for the absence of TBB_DEF length sampling by species in table III.C.6
C2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Actions to avoid deviations	Most actions refer to the need of financial support which would improve several issues regarding sampling. Financial support is not a real action but predictably will avoid shortfalls in the future. Reasons for deviations explained in this sub-section rather than in previous sub-sections.	Mostly	For next year and onwards MS is suggested to improve AR text introducing in right sub-sections results, explanations for deviations and actions to avoid shortfalls.
		Fiancial support presumably will solve problems in future.	Mostly	For next year and onwards MS is suggested to improve AR text introducing in right sub-sections results, explanations for deviations and actions to avoid shortfalls.
D	Recreational fisheries	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Even if not present, MS should correctly report in the table the species object of the recreational fisheries in the Med&BS region, and should indicate in the appropriate column if the species are present or no in the current data collection	No	MS is requested to complete, update and re-submit Table III.D.1
Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea	D1	No comments	NA	see above (re-submission of table)
		No comments	NA	No action needed
		No comments	NA	No action needed
	D2	No comments	NA	No action needed
		Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed
		Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed
E	D4	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed
		Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed
	Biological stock-related variables	No comments	Yes	No action needed.
Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea	E1	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Merlangius merlangius is missing in table III.E.2 whereas it is present in table III.E.1. Long plan sampling scheme is not indicated in the table.	Mostly	MS to resubmit the AR with table III.E.2 fulfilled, and if relevant amended text accordingly
		Columns I-J wrongly filled, so column on precision target missing.	Mostly	MS to resubmit the AR with table III.E.3 fulfilled, and if relevant amended text accordingly
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
		All planned number of fish to be sampled are achieved with good rates, including whiting (previously not present in table III.E.2). Some data also collected for other species and results provided in AR annexes.	Yes	No action needed
		NA	NA	NA
	E2	NA	NA	NA
		NA	NA	NA
	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			

Member State:		Romania		
		AR year	2014	
		Version of the AR reviewed	May 2015	
		Version of the NP proposal	NP 2011-2013 - version 2010	
			EWG Answer	
		Overall compliance	Mostly	
			EWG	
			judgement	
			EWG - Action needed?	
F	E4	Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA
		Actions to avoid deviations		
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	NA	NA
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	NA	NA
	Transversal variables			
	Is Table III.F.1 consistent with AR guidelines?		NP year and AR year in the header are missing.	Yes MS should provide NP year and AR year in the header in theh future
	F1	Capacity		
		F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
			Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments Yes
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments Yes
	F13		Are the deviations explained?	No comments NA
			Are the deviations justified?	No comments NA
		F13	Actions to avoid deviations	
			Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments NA
			Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments NA
F2	Effort			
		F21	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
			Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments Yes
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments Yes
	F22		Are the deviations explained?	No comments NA
			Are the deviations justified?	No comments NA
		F22	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
			Is respective data quality information given?	No comments Yes
	F23		Are the deviations explained?	No comments NA
			Are the deviations justified?	No comments NA
F3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments NA
			Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments NA
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments NA
	F24		Actions to avoid deviations	
			Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments NA
			Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments NA
	Landings			
		F31	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
			Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments Yes
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments Yes
F32		Are the deviations explained?	No comments NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments NA	
	F32	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is respective data quality information given?	No comments Yes	
	F33		Are the deviations explained?	No comments NA
			Are the deviations justified?	No comments NA
		F33	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments NA
	F34		Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments NA
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments NA
G	Research surveys at sea			
		G1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
			Is Table III.G.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments Yes
			Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	The NP proposal foresaw conducting a pelagic survey in the 2nd and 4th quarter, but the AR reports on a survey in the 3rd quarter. Even when accepting the logistic difficulties in organising the survey, it is not clear to which extent the realised time slot (July) is appropriate for addressing the stock assessment needs for pelagic species in the Black Sea. The explanation provided in the AR text on not being able to conduct the 4th quarter pelagic survey is not clear. The Bulgarian AR indeed reports on successful conduction of their part of the pelagic survey in Oct-Nov 2014.
	G2		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly
			Are the deviations explained?	MS should clarify why the pelagic survey in the 4th quarter was not carried out.
			Are the deviations justified?	see above Partly
			Is a map of each survey with achieved sampling activities provided?	see above Partly
	G4		Are the deviations explained?	see above No
				see above Yes
IV	Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry			
	A			



<b>Member State:</b>	<b>Romania</b>
<b>AR year</b>	<b>2014</b>
<b>Version of the AR reviewed</b>	May 2015
<b>Version of the NP proposal</b>	NP 2011-2013 - version 2010
	<b>EWG Answer</b>
<b>Overall compliance</b>	<b>Mostly</b>

		EWG	
		judgement	EWG - Action needed?
		EWG Comment	
		Reference year 2014 for data collection in 2014	Yes Ms is asked to clarify reference year
A1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal <a href="#">Is Table IV.A.3 consistent with AR guidelines?</a> <a href="#">Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?</a> <a href="#">Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?</a> <a href="#">Are the deviations explained?</a> <a href="#">Are the deviations justified?</a>		
		No comment	Yes No action needed
		No comment	Yes No action needed
		No comment	NA No action needed
A2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal <a href="#">Is respective data quality information given?</a> <a href="#">Are the deviations explained?</a> <a href="#">Are the deviations justified?</a>	No comment	Yes No action needed
		No comment	NA No action needed
		No comment	NA No action needed
A3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations <a href="#">Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?</a> <a href="#">Are the responsive actions described ?</a> <a href="#">Are the responsive actions acceptable?</a>	No comment	NA No action needed
		No comment	NA No action needed
		No comment	NA No action needed
A4	Actions to avoid deviations <a href="#">Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?</a> <a href="#">Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?</a>	No comment	Yes No action needed
		No comment	Yes No action needed
B	<b>Collection of data concerning the processing industry</b> <a href="#">Is Table IV.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?</a>	No comment	Yes No action needed
		Specification by segments is required when type of data collection differs among segments. MS applied census for all segments, thus data should be presented by "all segments", currently, part of variables is presented by segments, the rest part by "all segments", it is confusing to follow	Yes No action needed
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal <a href="#">Is Table IV.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?</a> <a href="#">Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?</a>  <a href="#">Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?</a>  <a href="#">Are the deviations explained?</a>	Improvement due to change to census	Yes No action needed
		Significant decrease in numbers of enterprises compared to NP.	Partly MS is asked to verify number of enterprises in the population and explain significant differences to NP figures.
		No description in terms of significant difference in population number, other minor deviations explained.	Mostly MS is asked to verify number of enterprises in the population and explain significant differences to NP figures.
		No justification in terms of significant difference in population number, other minor deviations explained.	Partly MS is asked to verify number of enterprises in the population and explain significant differences to NP figures.
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal <a href="#">Is respective data quality information given?</a> <a href="#">Are the deviations explained?</a> <a href="#">Are the deviations justified?</a>		
		No comment	Yes No action needed
		No comment	NA No action needed
		No comment	NA No action needed
B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations <a href="#">Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?</a> <a href="#">Are the responsive actions described ?</a> <a href="#">Are the responsive actions acceptable?</a>	No comment	NA No action needed
		No comment	NA No action needed
		No comment	NA No action needed
B4	Actions to avoid deviations <a href="#">Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?</a> <a href="#">Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?</a>	No comment	NA No action needed
		No comment	NA No action needed
V	<b>Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem</b> 1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal  <a href="#">Is Table V.1 consistent with AR guidelines?</a> 2 Actions to avoid deviations <a href="#">Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described?</a> <a href="#">Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?</a>	Time lag for indicators 8 and 9 not provided. Why are some data only available in June 2015?	Mostly MS to provide information on time lag for indicator 8 and 9, and on the availability of data in June 2015
		No comments	Yes No action needed
		No comments	Yes No action needed
VI	<b>Module for management and use of the data</b> 1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal  <a href="#">Is Table VI.1 consistent with AR guidelines?</a>  <a href="#">Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?</a> <a href="#">Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?</a> <a href="#">Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?</a> <a href="#">Are the deviations explained?</a> <a href="#">Are the deviations justified?</a> 2 Actions to avoid deviations <a href="#">Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?</a> <a href="#">Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?</a>	MS shall use Latin names for the species. Aquaculture data call is missing.	Mostly MS to resubmit the table fully completed according to the guidelines and with the appropriate changes.
		MS shall use Latin names for the species. Aquaculture data call is missing.	Mostly MS to resubmit the table fully completed according to the guidelines and with the appropriate changes.
		No comments	Yes No action needed
		No comments	Yes No action needed
		NA	NA No action needed
		NA	NA No action needed
VII	<b>Follow-up of STECF recommendation (-&gt; dealt with under II.B.2)</b>		
VIII	<b>List of acronyms and abbreviations</b> <a href="#">Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?</a>	No comment	Yes No action needed
IX	<b>Comments, suggestions and reflections</b> <a href="#">Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?</a>	No comment	Yes No action needed
X	<b>References</b>  <a href="#">Is there a complete list of references?</a>	No comment	Yes No action needed
XI	<b>Annexes</b>  <a href="#">Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?</a> <a href="#">Are relevant bilateral and/or multilateral agreements included?</a>		
		Too many annexes.	Mostly MS should restrict number of annexes on relevant ones in future AR.
		No comment	Yes No action needed

Member State:		Slovenia	
	AR year	2014	
	Version of the AR reviewed	May 2015	
	Version of the NP proposal	NP 2011-2013 amended for 2013 - October 2010 ?	
		EWG Answer	
	Overall compliance	Mostly	
		EWG Comment	EWG judgement
			EWG - Action needed?
I	General framework		
	Is Table I.A.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes
		They are regional agreements rather than formal multilateral agreements.	NA
II	National data collection organisation		
A	National correspondent and participating institutes		
	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	No comments	Yes
	Is there a national DCF website available?	No comments	Yes
	Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?	No comments	Yes
	Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	No comments	Yes
B	Regional and International coordination		
B1	Attendance of international meetings		
	Is Table II.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes
	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	NA	NA
B2	Follow-up of regional and international recommendations and agreements		
	In Table II.B.2, are the relevant regional and international recommendations (RCM's/STECF/LM/Survey Planning Groups) listed?	No comments	Yes
	Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes
III	Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector		
A	General description of the fishing sector		
	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	No comments	Yes
B	Economic variables		
	Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?	No comments	Yes
	SUPRA-REGION Mediterranean and Black Sea		
	Is Table III.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Inactive should be used instead of "nonactive". Length classes should be coded according to guidelines (e.g. "12-< 18 m"). Figures in column M should be provided as %	Yes
	Is Table III.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	Length classes is not coded according to guidelines (e.g. "12-< 18 m").	Yes
	Is Table III.B.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	Filet effort and capacity data should be reported in III.F.1.	Yes
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA
B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	NA
	Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	NA
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA
B4	Actions to avoid deviations		
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	NA
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA
C	Biological metier related variables		
	Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	No comments	Yes
	Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea		
C1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Some metiers LVL6 codings not consistent with Decision 2010/93/EU (Appendix IV metier level 6) and as agreed by the relevant RCM. Under the reference period MS reports on 2014. MS applying metier based sampling scheme (it should be the case of Slovenia) should give as reference period 2012-2013.	Mostly
	Is Table III.C.4 consistent with AR guidelines?	4 metiers identified for sampling in III.C.1 but a sampling frame A4 covering a fifth metier (PTM_SPF) has been introduced in III.C.4.	Mostly
	Is Table III.C.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes
	Is Table III.C.6 consistent with AR guidelines?	Table correctly filled. However III.C.4 refers that MS is applying concurrent sampling at sea under scheme 1, but only 2 species(anchovy and sardine) reported in table III.C.6.	Mostly
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	However III.C.4 refers that MS is applying concurrent sampling at sea under scheme 1, only 2 species(anchovy and sardine) reported in table III.C.6.	Partly
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Large undersampling for the most important Slovenian metiers.	Partly
	Are the deviations explained?	Incomprehensible text AR mixing metier related variables and transversal variables. Explanations on deviations not clear or detailed.	No
	Are the deviations justified?	Explanations on deviations not clear or detailed, so not justified.	No
C2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		



<b>Member State:</b>	<b>Slovenia</b>
<b>AR year</b>	<b>2014</b>
<b>Version of the AR reviewed</b>	May 2015
<b>Version of the NP proposal</b>	NP 2011-2013 amended for 2013 - October 2010 ?
	<b>EWG Answer</b>
<b>Overall compliance</b>	<b>Mostly</b>

D	C4	Actions to avoid deviations	Are the deviations explained?
			Are the deviations justified?
			Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?
			Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?
			Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region? Is Table III.D.1 consistent with the AR guidelines?
	D1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?
			Are the deviations explained?
			Are the deviations justified?
	D2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Are the deviations explained?
			Are the deviations justified?
E	D4	Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?
			Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?
			Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?
	E1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is Table III.E.1 consistent with AR guidelines?
			Is Table III.E.2 consistent with AR guidelines?
			Is Table III.E.3 consistent with AR guidelines?
			Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?
	E2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Are the deviations explained?
			Are the deviations justified?
F	E4	Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?
			Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?
			Is Table III.F.1 consistent with AR guidelines?
	F1	Capacity	
	F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?
			Are the deviations explained?
			Are the deviations justified?
	F13	Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?
			Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?
	F2	Effort	
	F21	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	

EWG Comment	EWG judgement	EWG - Action needed?
No information on data quality is reported	No	MS must provide information on data quality and resubmit the AR text accordingly.
No information on data quality is reported	No	MS must provide information on data quality and resubmit the AR text accordingly.
No information about actions to avoid shortfalls in future	No	MS must provide information about actions to avoid shortfalls in future and ammend the AR accordingly.
No information about actions to avoid shortfalls in future	No	MS must provide information about actions to avoid shortfalls in future and ammend the AR accordingly.
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

It is difficult to understand which data were really collected in 2014. We assume that there is no data from weekly and daily licenses nor from inspections at sea, and that only data from annual licenses are available	Mostly	MS is requested to confirm the EWG assumption in the EWG comment box. If the assumption is not correct then MS is requested to better clarify the recreational fisheries data collected in 2014.
It is difficult to understand which data were really collected in 2014. We assume that there is no data from weekly and daily licenses nor from inspections at sea, and that only data from annual licenses are available	Mostly	see action above
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

It is difficult to understand which data were really collected in 2014. We assume that there is no data from weekly and daily licenses nor from inspections at sea, and that only data from annual licenses are available	Mostly	see action above
No comments	NA	No action needed

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
Sardina pilchardus length@age stock variable listed 3 times	Mostly	MS must review the table in what concerns the variable (column I) and resubmit the AR tables.
However length@age for Sardina pilchardus is listed 3 times, it is perceived that the sampling scheme is consistent with the NP proposal	Yes	No action needed
For both species sampled all the variables are undersampled	Partly	No action needed
Deviatons are explained by the lack of national legislation requiring fishermen to accept the observers on-board. As data souce is refered to be "Comercial" it's no possible to understand in samples could be obtained from other sources apart from at-sea sampling (i.e. vendor). If fishermen do not accept observers on board MS should investigate other sources of data.	Mostly	MS to clarify if "commercial" data source (column J) only includes samples collected at sea.
If fishermen do not accept observers on board MS should investigate other sources of data (i.e. self-sampling, vendor)	Mostly	MS to justify why no other data sources apart from samples collected at sea are being used to collect stock related vriables.

No information on data quality is reported	No	MS must provide information on data quality according to the guidelines.
No information on data quality is reported	No	MS must provide information on data quality according to the guidelines.

No commends	Mostly	No action needed
Changes on the sampling scheme appear to solve stock related variables undersampling.	Mostly	No action needed

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

<b>Member State:</b>		<b>Slovenia</b>	
	<b>AR year</b>	<b>2014</b>	
	<b>Version of the AR reviewed</b>	May 2015	
	<b>Version of the NP proposal</b>	NP 2011-2013 amended for 2013 - October 2010 ?	
		<b>EWG Answer</b>	
	<b>Overall compliance</b>	<b>Mostly</b>	
		<b>EWG</b>	
		<b>judgement</b>	<b>EWG - Action needed?</b>
	<b>EWG Comment</b>		
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes No action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA No action needed
<b>F22</b>	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA No action needed
<b>F23</b>	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	NA No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA No action needed
<b>F24</b>	Actions to avoid deviations		
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	NA No action needed
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA No action needed
<b>F3</b>	<b>Landings</b>		
<b>F31</b>	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes No action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA No action needed
<b>F32</b>	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA No action needed
<b>F33</b>	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	NA No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA No action needed
<b>F34</b>	Actions to avoid deviations		
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	NA No action needed
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA No action needed
<b>G</b>	<b>Research surveys at sea</b>		
<b>G1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Is Table III.G.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Column T not calculated correctly	Mostly AR2015: MS is requested to correctly calculate the %achieved target in III.G.1 column T
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes No action needed
		Comments in Table III.G.1 are not consistent with achievements in the table. Table is not in line with AR text with respect to achieved hauls.	Partly MS is requested to resubmit Table III.G.1 so the comment 'Sampling plans 100% achieved' is in line with the achievements in the table (MEDITS 50% fish hauls, MEDIAS < 50% Echo Nm, 50% pelagic trawls)
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?		
		it is unclear what 'TD table' and 'TA table' refers to	Yes AR2015: MS is requested to either fully write down acronyms/abbreviations, or incorporate acronyms/abbreviations in section VIII
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes No action needed
	Is a map of each survey with achieved sampling activities provided?		
<b>G2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	No comments	Yes No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA No action needed
<b>G4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid deviations</b>		
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?		
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA No action needed
		Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA No action needed
<b>IV</b>	<b>Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry</b>		
<b>A</b>	<b>Collection of data concerning the aquaculture</b>		
	Is Table IV.A.1 consistent with AR guidelines	No comments	Yes No action needed
	Is Table IV.A.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes No action needed
	Is Table IV.A.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes No action needed
<b>A1</b>	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes No action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA No action needed
<b>A2</b>	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA No action needed
<b>A3</b>	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	NA No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA No action needed
<b>A4</b>	Actions to avoid deviations		
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	NA No action needed
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA No action needed
<b>B</b>	<b>Collection of data concerning the processing industry</b>		
	Is Table IV.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Calculation of achieved sample rate/planned sample rate is wrongly calculated but according to guidelines template	Yes No action needed
	Is Table IV.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes No action needed
<b>B1</b>	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		





Member	Spain
AR year	2014
Version of the AR reviewed	30 May 2015
Version of the NP proposal	30 Oct 2012
	EWG Answer
Overall compliance	Yes

	EWG Comment	EWG judgement	EWG - Action needed?
I General framework			
Is Table I.A.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Is Table I.A.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	MS to clarify if agreement with Portugal in NAFO is still valid.
II National data collection organisation			
A National correspondent and participating institutes			
Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Is there a national DCF website available?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	No comments	Yes	For the future MS should provide minutes of the national coordination meetings.
B Regional and International coordination			
B1 Attendance of international meetings			
Is Table II.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations and agreements			
In Table II.B.2, are the relevant regional and international recommendations (RCM's/STECF/LM/Survey Planning Groups) listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
III Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector			
A General description of the fishing sector			
Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
B Economic	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?			
SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea, Eastern Arctic, North Atlantic			
Is Table III.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Is Table III.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Is Table III.B.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	The planned and achieved sample number is very low and in some cases it might not be representative. Achieved sample rate for 19 active segments out of 60 has less than 4%. At the same time for 23 fleet segments achieved sample number was from 2-3 (when average population is 65). It is stated that sample size is calculated with the Neyman formula, but non indication is given on the target variable considered to apply this algorithm.	Yes	MS is adviced to increase planned sample numbers in order to achieve statistically reasonable sample numbers.
Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	NA	No action needed
Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
Are the deviations justified?			
B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
B4 Actions to avoid deviations			
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
SUPRA-REGION Mediterranean and Black Sea			
Is Table III.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Is Table III.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Is Table III.B.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
B4 Actions to avoid deviations			
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed





Member	Spain
AR year	2014
Version of the AR reviewed	30 May 2015
Version of the NP proposal	30 Oct 2012
	EWG Answer
Overall compliance	Yes

	EWG Comment	EWG judgement	EWG - Action needed?
C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
Is Table III.C.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Region named after 2 different designations "Mediterranean and Black Sea" and "Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea" (column C)	Yes	Next year and onwards MS must submit the table consistent with the guidelines, including Regions naming.
Is Table III.C.4 consistent with AR guidelines?	Region named after 2 different designations "Mediterranean and Black Sea" and "Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea" (column C). MS should add the countries participating in the sampling of large pelagic as decided at Regional level.	Yes	Next year and onwards MS must submit the table consistent with the guidelines, including Regions naming and referring to MS participating in sampling.
Is Table III.C.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	Region named after 2 different designations "Mediterranean and Black Sea" and "Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea" (column C). MS should add the countries participating in the sampling of large pelagic as decided at Regional level.	Yes	Next year and onwards MS must submit the table consistent with the guidelines, including Regions naming and referring to MS participating in sampling.
Is Table III.C.6 consistent with AR guidelines?	MS should add the countries participating in the sampling of large pelagic as decided at Regional level.	Yes	Next year and onwards MS must submit the table consistent with the guidelines, referring to MS participating in sampling.
Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Planned no. Of fishing trips not achieved for 9 metiers (both at sea and on shore). No discards data are present.	Mostly	No action needed
Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
C4 Actions to avoid deviations			
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No actions descried	No	MS must provide information actions to avoid shortfalls in future in what concerns administrative issues.
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No actions described. Cannot judge.	NA	NA

Other Regions

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
Is Table III.C.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed
Is Table III.C.4 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed
Is Table III.C.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed
Is Table III.C.6 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed
Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	For around 10 metiers (considering all areas) has not been achieved the planned number of fishing trips (both at sea and on shore). For some metier was not possible to collect discards data. Sampling activties couldn't covered all the species initially planned	Mostly	No actions needed
Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed
Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed
C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed
Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed
C4 Actions to avoid deviations			
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed

D Recreational fisheries

Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed
Is Table III.D.1 consistent with the AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed

North Atlantic

D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
D4 Actions to avoid deviations			
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed

Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea

D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed

Member	Spain		
	AR year	2014	
	Version of the AR reviewed	30 May 2015	
	Version of the NP proposal	30 Oct 2012	
		EWG Answer	
	Overall compliance	Yes	
		EWG Comment	EWG judgement
			EWG - Action needed?
D4 Actions to avoid deviations			
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	No action needed
E Biological stock-related variables			
	Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	No comments	Yes
North Sea & Eastern Arctic			
E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is Table III.E.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes
	Is Table III.E.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	No actions needed
	Is Table III.E.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	No actions needed
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	No actions needed
		Most stocks oversampled but without additional costs	Yes
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Since the observer remains on-board during all the fishing, the number of individuals to be sampled cannot be planned in advance.	No actions needed
		No comments	Yes
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	No actions needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	No actions needed
E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	No actions needed
E4 Actions to avoid deviations			
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	Yes
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	No actions needed
North Atlantic			
E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is Table III.E.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes
	Is Table III.E.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	No actions needed
	Is Table III.E.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	No actions needed
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	No actions needed
		For a minor no. of species and the relative parameters the number of planned specimens has not been achieved. A large no. of stock have been oversampled.	Yes
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Though previous judgement was "Yes" minor undersampling and oversampling is justified in the text.	No actions needed
		Though previous judgement was "Yes" minor undersampling and oversampling is justified in the text and it is acceptable.	Yes
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	No actions needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	No actions needed
E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	No actions needed
E4 Actions to avoid deviations			
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	Yes
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	No actions needed
Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea			
E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is Table III.E.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes
	Is Table III.E.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	No actions needed
		Region named after 2 different designations "Mediterranean and Black Sea" and "Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea" (column C)	Yes
	Is Table III.E.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	No actions needed
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	For a minor no. of species and the relative parameters the number of planned specimens has not been achieved. A large no. of stock have been oversampled. Sparus aurata is over the 200 tons and over the 10% in landing but it is not present in the sampling sheme.	Mostly
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Except for Sparus aurata (which is not actually present in table III.E.3, so not planned for collection of stock related variables) deviations are explained.	MS to explain why Sparus aurata is not being sampled.
		No comments	Yes
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	No actions needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	No actions needed
E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	No actions needed
E4 Actions to avoid deviations			
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	Yes
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	No actions needed
Other regions			
E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is Table III.E.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes
	Is Table III.E.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	No actions needed
	Is Table III.E.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	No actions needed
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	No actions needed









Member **Spain**

AR year	2014
Version of the AR reviewed	30 May 2015
Version of the NP proposal	30 Oct 2012
EWG Answer	
Overall compliance	Yes

EWG Comment	EWG judgement	EWG - Action needed?
-------------	---------------	----------------------

V Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem

1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table V.1 consistent with AR guidelines?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

2 Actions to avoid deviations

Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described?

Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed
--	----	------------------

Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?

Not Applicable: There are no deviations.	NA	No action needed
--	----	------------------

VI Module for management and use of the data

1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table VI.1 consistent with AR guidelines?

MARE data calls (effort, fleet economics, fish processing, aquaculture) missing.	Partly	Ms to resubmit the table fully completed with all data calls (effort, fleet economics, fish processing, aquaculture)
--	--------	--

Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

MARE data calls (effort, fleet economics, fish processing, aquaculture) missing.	Partly	Ms to resubmit the table fully completed with all data calls (effort, fleet economics, fish processing, aquaculture)
--	--------	--

Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

Are the deviations explained?

NA	NA	No action needed
----	----	------------------

Are the deviations justified?

NA	NA	No action needed
----	----	------------------

2 Actions to avoid deviations

Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?

NA	NA	No action needed
----	----	------------------

Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?

NA	NA	No action needed
----	----	------------------

VII Follow-up of : (-> dealt with under II.B.2)

VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations

Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

IX Comments, suggestions and reflections

Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

X References

Is there a complete list of references?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

XI Annexes

Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

Are relevant bilateral and/or multilateral agreements included?

MS in the AR text refer to attachment which is not available during evaluation	No	Can not judge
--	----	---------------





<b>Member State:</b>		<b>Sweden</b>	
	AR year		<b>2014</b>
	Version of the AR reviewed		28 May 2015
	Version of the NP proposal		26 March 2013
		<b>EWG Answer</b>	
	<b>Overall compliance</b>	<b>Mostly</b>	
		<b>EWG Comment</b>	<b>EWG judgement</b>
			<b>EWG - Action needed?</b>
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Most sampling frames/metiers undersampled.	Partly
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes
<b>C2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes
<b>C4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid deviations</b>		
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	Yes
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes
<b>North Sea and Eastern Arctic</b>			
<b>C1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Is Table III.C.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes
	Is Table III.C.4 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes
	Is Table III.C.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes
	Is Table III.C.6 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	The sampling scheme has changed from the original NP to randomised sampling for some metiers. Shift from quota sampling to probability sampling is in line with recommendations on Statistically Sound Sampling Schemes.	Yes
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Most sampling frames/metiers undersampled.	Partly
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes
<b>C2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes
<b>C4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid deviations</b>		
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	Yes
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes
<b>D</b>	<b>Recreational fisheries</b>		
	Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?	No comments	Yes
		Table III.D.1 mentions derogations for eels and sharks. AR text mentions that recreational fisheries for eels and dogfish (the only relevant shark species) is forbidden by national law.	Yes
<b>Baltic Sea</b>			
<b>D1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes
<b>D2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes
<b>D4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid deviations</b>		
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	Yes
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes
<b>North Sea and Eastern Arctic</b>			
<b>D1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes
<b>D2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes
<b>D4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid deviations</b>		
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	Yes
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes
<b>E</b>	<b>Biological stock-related variables</b>		
	Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	No comments	Yes
<b>Baltic Sea</b>			
<b>E1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Is Table III.E.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes
	Is Table III.E.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes
	Is Table III.E.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Majority of planned stocks undersampled	Partly
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes
<b>E2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes
<b>E4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid deviations</b>		
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	Yes
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes
<b>North Sea and Eastern Arctic</b>			
<b>E1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		



<b>Member State:</b>	<b>Sweden</b>	
<b>AR year</b>	<b>2014</b>	
<b>Version of the AR reviewed</b>	28 May 2015	
<b>Version of the NP proposal</b>	26 March 2013	
	<b>EWG Answer</b>	
<b>Overall compliance</b>	<b>Mostly</b>	

		<b>EWG Comment</b>	<b>EWG judgement</b>	<b>EWG - Action needed?</b>
	Is Table III.E.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed
	Is Table III.E.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed
	Is Table III.E.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Some stocks are undersampled, some other oversampled	Yes	No actions needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed
<b>E2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed
<b>E4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid deviations</b>			
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No actions needed
<b>F</b>	<b>Transversal variables</b>			
	Is Table III.F.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Information on prices by commercial species missing.	Yes	MS should provide information on prices by commercial species in the future
<b>F1</b>	<b>Capacity</b>			
<b>F11</b>	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
<b>F13</b>	Actions to avoid deviations			
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
<b>F2</b>	<b>Effort</b>			
<b>F21</b>	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
<b>F22</b>	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
<b>F23</b>	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
<b>F24</b>	Actions to avoid deviations			
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
<b>F3</b>	<b>Landings</b>			
<b>F31</b>	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
<b>F32</b>	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
<b>F33</b>	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
<b>F34</b>	Actions to avoid deviations			
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
<b>G</b>	<b>Research surveys at sea</b>			
<b>G1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Is Table III.G.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is a map of each survey with achieved sampling activities provided?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<b>G2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<b>G4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid deviations</b>			
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed

Member State:		Sweden			
AR year		2014			
Version of the AR reviewed		28 May 2015			
Version of the NP proposal		26 March 2013			
		EWG Answer			
Overall compliance		Mostly			
		EWG Comment	EWG judgement		
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?		No comments	Yes		
			EWG - Action needed?		
			No action needed		
IV Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry					
A Collection of data concerning the aquaculture					
A1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is Table IV.A.1 consistent with AR guidelines	Cells should not be deleted from the table		
		Is Table IV.A.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No information on quality indicators is given.		
		Is Table IV.A.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	Collection scheme seems to be A and C, this is not reflected in table IV.A.2.		
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comment		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comment		
		Are the deviations explained?	No comment		
		Are the deviations justified?	No comment		
		A2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is respective data quality information given?	No comment
				Are the deviations explained?	No comment
				Are the deviations justified?	No comment
A3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comment
		Are the responsive actions described ?	No comment		
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comment		
		A4	Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comment
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comment				
B Collection of data concerning the processing industry					
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			Is Table IV.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Reference year may not be correct. Collection scheme A and C in table IV.B.2 is mentionend, in IV.B.1 only A is mentioned, should be consistent.
		Is Table IV.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	Reference year 2011?		
		Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comment		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comment		
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Are the deviations explained?	No comment		
		Are the deviations justified?	No comment		
		Is respective data quality information given?	No comment		
		Are the deviations explained?	No comment		
B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comment		
		Are the responsive actions described ?	No comment		
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comment		
		B4	Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comment
Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comment				
V Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem					
1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			Is Table V.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.		
		Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	Not Applicable: There are no deviations.		
		VI Module for management and use of the data			
1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is Table VI.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments		
		Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments		
		Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	No comments		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Only delay to finalize database development for transversal data. Planned to be achieved in 2015.		
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments		
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments		
		2	Actions to avoid deviations	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments
				Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments
				VII Follow-up of STECF recommendatio (-> dealt with under II.B.2)	
				VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations	
IX	Comments, suggestions and reflections	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comment		
		Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	No comment		
		Is there a complete list of references?	No comment		
		X References			
XI	Annexes	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	No comment		
		Are relevant bilateral and/or multilateral agreements included?	Bilateral Agreement missing (SWE-DEU)		

Member State:		United Kingdom		
AR year		2014		
Version of the AR reviewed		May 2015		
Version of the NP proposal		Oct 2012?		
		EWG Answer		
Overall compliance		Yes		
		EWG Comment	EWG judgement	
		EWG - Action needed?		
I	General framework	No comments	Yes	No actions needed
	Is Table I.A.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	For the future MS should better clarify validity comments
	Is Table I.A.2 consistent with AR guidelines?			
II	National data collection organisation			
A	National correspondent and participating institutes			
	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is there a national DCF website available?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	No comments	Yes	For the future MS should provide minutes of the national coordination meetings.
B	Regional and International coordination			
B1	Attendance of international meetings			
	Is Table II.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	NA	NA	No action needed.
B2	Follow-up of regional and international recommendations and agreements			
	In Table II.B.2, are the relevant regional and international recommendations (RCM's/STECF/LM/Survey Planning Groups) listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
III	Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector			
A	General description of the fishing sector			
	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
B	Economic variables	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?			
	SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea, Eastern Arctic, North Atlantic			
	Is Table III.B.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Planned sample rate is not calculated. Clustered segments not marked with an asterix. Sample rate on inactive vessels should not be 0.	Mostly	MS should fill in III.B.1 according to guidelines and resubmit table.
	Is Table III.B.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	Clusters names should not contain merged length classes, but should be marked with asterisk.	Mostly	MS should name segments according to appendix III of DCF regulation and resubmit table.
	Is Table III.B.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	Sample/response rates do not correspond to figures in IIIB1. Achieved sample rate for census sample survey should be equal to response rate.	Mostly	MS should fill in III.B.3 according to guidelines and resubmit table.
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	Information given in the text does not match with information in tables: reference year should be 2013 and not 2011.	Mostly	In III.B.1 chapter MS should refer to reference year 2013 and resubmit text of AR.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Some specification in section on "capital value and capital cost" is missing (Price per capacity unit, asset share, lifetime)	Yes	Methods and assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs should be specified according to guidelines. MS should adjust text accordingly and resubmit.
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
B4	Actions to avoid deviations			
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
C	Biological metier related variables			
	Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	North Sea and Eastern Arctic			
C1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is Table III.C.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table III.C.4 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table III.C.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table III.C.6 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Very little sampling on the beam trawl fleets ashore (38% of targets achieved) and no concurrent at sea trips completed. Same for mollusc dredge fleet, where 50% of the shore based targets were reached and no concurrent at sea trips were achieved. Over sampling also achieved for the demersal trawl fleets.	Mostly	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	Budgets, access to vessels and the move towards probability based sampling schemes.	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
C2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
C4	Actions to avoid deviations			
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	North Atlantic			
C1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is Table III.C.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed







<b>Member State:</b>		<b>United Kingdom</b>	
<b>AR year</b>		<b>2014</b>	
<b>Version of the AR reviewed</b>		May 2015	
<b>Version of the NP proposal</b>		Oct 2012?	
		<b>EWG Answer</b>	
<b>Overall compliance</b>		<b>Yes</b>	
		<b>EWG Comment</b>	<b>EWG judgement</b>
		<b>EWG - Action needed?</b>	
<b>E4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid deviations</b>		
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	Yes
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes
<b>F</b>	<b>Transversal variables</b>		
	Is Table III.F.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	Energy consumption not provided either in IIIB3 or IIIF1. Type of data collection scheme should be "A", not "C". From the text it is clear that transversal data are collected through a census (A) Reference year should be the same as AR in case when administrative data sources are used (e.g. logbooks, Fleet Register, sales notes etc.)	Yes
		MS should provide energy consumption variable either in IIIB3 or in IIIF1. MS should use proper code for sampling scheme in the future. MS should use proper reference year in the future.	
<b>F1</b>	<b>Capacity</b>		
	<b>F11</b> Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA
	<b>F13</b> Actions to avoid deviations		
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	NA
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA
<b>F2</b>	<b>Effort</b>		
	<b>F21</b> Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA
	<b>F22</b> Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA
	<b>F23</b> Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	NA
	Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA
	<b>F24</b> Actions to avoid deviations		
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	NA
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA
<b>F3</b>	<b>Landings</b>		
	<b>F31</b> Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA
	<b>F32</b> Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA
	<b>F33</b> Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	NA
	Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA
	<b>F34</b> Actions to avoid deviations		
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	NA
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA
<b>G</b>	<b>Research surveys at sea</b>		
	<b>G1</b> Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes
	Is a map of each survey with achieved sampling activities provided?	No comments	Yes
	<b>G2</b> Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	No comments	Yes
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes
	<b>G4</b> Actions to avoid deviations		
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future described ?	No comments	Yes
	Are actions to avoid deviations in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes
<b>IV</b>	<b>Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry</b>		
<b>A</b>	<b>Collection of data concerning the aquaculture</b>		
	Is Table IV.A.1 consistent with AR guidelines	No comment	Yes
	Is Table IV.A.2 consistent with AR guidelines?	No comment	Yes
	Is Table IV.A.3 consistent with AR guidelines?	Some quality indicators are missing for the variables (only one is provided).	Mostly
		MS is asked to resubmit table IV.A:3	
<b>A1</b>	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the sampling scheme consistent with the NP proposal?	In AR tables MS indicates scheme A and C (non-probability sample survey), but in AR text it is stated that A (Census) and B (Probability sample survey) was used.	Yes
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	In AR tables MS indicates scheme A and C (non-probability sample survey), but in AR text it is stated that A (Census) and B (Probability sample survey) was used.	Yes
	Are the deviations explained?	In AR tables MS indicates scheme A and C (non-probability sample survey), but in AR text it is stated that A (Census) and B (Probability sample survey) was used.	Mostly
		MS is asked to clarify and resubmit table IV.A.3 and IV.A.2 if necessary.	



## **ANNEX 4 – DATA TRANSMISSION ASSESSMENT**

BELGIUM										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
379	JRC	2014	Fleet economic		Depreciated Replacement value missing for 2008 for several fleet segments (e.g. DFN 1824, DRB 1824, DTS 1824, DTS 2440). Impact: Incomplete times series; not possible to estimate some economic indicators (e.g. net profit, RoFTA) for all FS, affects national and EU analyses	HIGH	UNKNOWN	In Belgium, DFN1824, DRB 1824, DTS1824 and DTS2440 are fleet segments which contain only 1 to 2 vessels. Due to the privacy aspects, it is not allowed to relaease the data of these fleet segments as identification of vessels could be done easaly and this could have an impact on the economic competition position of these vessels.	MS comment is acceptable. Even if clustered those segments will still remain confidential and can be reported only in fleet totals. Moreover those fleet segments are distinct and can not be clustered with other ones.	Satisfactory
380	JRC	2014	Fleet economic		Energy consumption missing for several fleet segments and years (e.g. DFN 1824 and DRB 1824 â€” 2008; DTS 1824 - 2008/09). Impact: Incomplete times series, affects national and EU analyses	HIGH	UNKNOWN	In Belgium, DFN1824,DTS1824 and DTS2440 are fleet segments which contain only 1 to 2 vessels. Due to the privacy aspects, it is not allowed to relaease the data of these fleet segments as identification of vessels could be done easaly and this could have an impact on the economic competition position of these vessels.	MS comment is acceptable. Even if clustered those segments will still remain confidential and can be reported only in fleet totals. Moreover those fleet segments are distinct and can not be clustered with other ones.	Satisfactory
381	JRC	2014	Fleet economic		Investment data missing in some years for some fleet segments (e.g. DFN 1824 â€” 2008 and 2011; DTS 1824 and 2440 â€” 2008). Impact: Incomplete times series, affects national and EU analyses	HIGH	UNKNOWN	In Belgium, DFN1824, DTS1824 and DTS2440 are fleet segments which contain only 1 to 2 vessels. Due to the privacy aspects, it is not allowed to relaease the data of these fleet segments as identification of vessels could be done easaly and this could have an impact on the economic competition position of these vessels.	MS comment is acceptable. Even if clustered those segments will still remain confidential and can be reported only in fleet totals. Moreover those fleet segments are distinct and can not be clustered with other ones.	Satisfactory
382	JRC	2014	Fleet economic		Capital value data missing for inactive vessels. Impact: Incomplete economic, time-series and national fleet analysis	HIGH	UNKNOWN	With the data AER2015, this has been changed. Inactive vessels are taken into the submission of data and the time serie is avalibla now as well.	Submission for DCF is mandatory for all variables and segments unless MS has a derogation. MS does not justify the failure. Considering the small size of inactive fleet, missing information has minor importance and no impact on AER.	Unknown
485	JRC	2014	Processing		Questionable data quality (Belgium excluded from the EU analysis) Missing data: all data for 2010; number of firms processing fish not as a main activity and the share of their turnover attributed to fish processing (all years); subsidies (2008-2010); imputed value of unpaid labour (2008-2010); male and female employees (2008-2010). Data was uploaded after the deadline.	HIGH	COVERAGE	Belgium is aware of this problem and has tried stepwis to improve the collection of the data of the processing industry. Since 2014, an expert is working with this topic, and as such, for the first time there has been a Belgian Chapter in the Report of Porcessing Industry. With this expertise recently in-house, the data for the future will be of better quality and more reliable.	Regardless the explanations about main reasons of low quality reported data and not appropriate strategy used for data collection in NP, no any derogation for fish processing sector were attributed to be a justifying reason not to submit 2010 data. Imputed value of unpaid labor (2008-2010) could possibly be zero values. As far as data is foreseen to collect in NP it has to be fulfilled. Moreover, MS should respect data submission deadlines.	Unsatisfactory
1	RCM	2014		NS&EA:age and legth data	the number of species in age and length samples in the RDB differed between before and after the extraction of sample records with no information from the RDB	UNKNOWN	QUALITY	During the RCM meeting, some verifications were realized and the records in the age samples with no age information but only length information were identified as data in the results of the number of species in the age samples. Also the records in the length samples with no information on the number of length measurements were identified as data in the results of the number of species in the length samples.	Issue raised by the RCM NS&EA is unclear. It seems that problem rather lies in the RDB than on MS' side. In order to solve such detailed problems, a direct communication between RDB technical management and MS would be more appropriate.	Unknown
2	RCM	2014		NA: age data	LEM individual ages and weights not uploaded	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	At the time of uploading the data in the RDB, these ages were not yet available in our old national database. These data have only been added to the old database, once the data call included LEM. From 2015 onwards, Belgium has set up a high quality new database ('Smartfish') and when an extaction is done today, all species are included. With the old system, priority was given to the stocks PLE, SQL and COD as working with the old database system was very time consuming and intensive. All other species are available over the past years, but were not transferred to teh database. As mentioned, this now not the case anymore and all data of all species are available in our database.	Issue to be investigated by DGMARE, all MSs participating in RCM, and the end user	Unknown
345	JRC	2014	Effort		No information submitted for vessels <10m in length.	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Belgium has no vessels <10m. This can be seen in the offvial vessel register and is confirmed in the reporting of the annual AR.	MS response is acceptable	Satisfactory



BELGIUM										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1015	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	anb-78ab: Efforts should be made to obtain reliable estimates of total catches in order to improve the assessment.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This comment is unclear. MS assumes it is about the combined landings of MON (Lophius piscatorius) and ANK (Lophius bodugessa). This will implicate that with the data raising, the landings will need to be split in an artifical way. MS would appreciate guideleines how to do this in the best way	MS reply is acceptable.Â General comments/statements should not be included in the summary sheets.Â The summary sheets should only include issues which impact on the WG' ability to carry out stock assessments and which MS's can reasonably take action to improve the data.Â It would be useful for WG's to highlight a specific issue and which MS's are expected to take action.	Satisfactory
1038	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	anb-78ab: Accurate estimates of growth parameters are needed to facilitate the development of an analytical assessment.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	The comment is unclear. It is not clear what is expected from the MS to solve this issue.	MS reply is acceptable.Â This comment is too generic - an action should be specified for the MS to follow up.	Satisfactory
1045	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	anb-78ab: increased discarding in recent years has resulted in uncertainties in recent catch values. An increase in the discard sampling level is necessary for providing catch advice.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	In 2013= 15 trips were sampled, 359 hauls of which 234 conatined MON (65%)	MS reply is acceptable.Â France has the majority of the landings from this stock (accounting for approximately 60% of the landings).Â Belgium have very minor landings.Â There is no evidence showing precision on catch estimates in the WGBIE report.Â	Satisfactory
1079	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	gug-89a: The data for catches of grey gurnard are considered highly unreliable. Catch statistics are incomplete and are often not separated by species.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This a general comment, it is unclear what is expected from the MS.Â	MS reply is acceptable.Â This is a generic comment and does not belong in the data tables, as it is addressed to no MS specifically and no action is identified	Satisfactory
1103	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: HAWG. EcoRegion: North Sea	her-47d3: ICES is concerned about the lack of information on unallocated removals in all herring fisheries; efforts should be made to maintain observer coverage across fleets that catch a substantial proportion of pelagic fish and to report on these issues. Introduction of the EU landing obligation may change this situation.	MEDIUM	COVERAGE	Thisis a general comment however, the comment is not very relevant for BE. BE has no pelagic fisheries and does not target herring. Catches of herring are very small (cfr data of BE in Intercatch).	MS reply is acceptable.Â General comments/statements should not be included in the summary sheets.Â The summary sheets should only include issues which impact on the WG' ability to carry out stock assessments and which MS's can reasonably take action to improve the data.Â It would be useful for WG's to highlight a specific issue and which MS's are expected to take action.	Satisfactory
1110	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	her-noss: While discarding in the fisheries of this stock is considered to be low, slippage occurs. The amount of slippage is unquantified and thus cannot be accounted for in the assessment.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Thisis a general comment however, the comment is not very relevant for BE. BE has no pelagic fisheries and does not target herring. Catches of herring are very small (cfr data of BE in Intercatch)	MS reply is acceptable.Â General comments/statements in the summary sheets should be avoided.Â The summary sheets should only include issues which impact on the WG' ability to carry out stock assessments and which MS's can reasonably take action to improve the data.Â It would be useful for WG's to highlight a specific issue and which MS's are expected to take action.	Satisfactory

BELGIUM										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1123	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	hke-nrth: Assessment data arrived after the ICES data call deadline, thus reducing time to review and audit the assessment results. Although the data were used, the delay may reduce ICES quality assurance.	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Belgium has always been dependent of the administration for receieving the landings data and logbook data. These data were often only delivered to the stock assesment experts between end of March and halfway April. Once these data are recieved, there is still time neded to check the quality and to use the data before it can be sent to ICES. From 2015 , Belgium has direct access to the data of the administraion, which eases the use of these data. This can be seen already in the ICES data Call 2015, for which the requested deadlines have been reached by Belgium.	MS' s should ensure that data call deadlines are respected.Â However Belgium indicates that the reason for the late submission of Belgian data has been resolved and should not occur from 2015 onwards	Satisfactory
1132	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	hke-nrth: Only partial discards are included in the assessment and forecast. In order to reduce uncertainty in discard estimates, an increased sampling level for on-board observer programmes is needed for some fleets (non-Nephrops trawlers, gillnetters, and longliners).	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This comment is not relevant for BE	MS reply is acceptable.Â WG's should specify in the summary sheets, which MS's the comments are directed at, and what remedial action is expected, to avoid all MS's having a perceived non - compliance issue	Satisfactory
1141	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	hke-nrth: There is large uncertainty associated with the estimation of discards. Hake otoliths are currently collected but not used in the assessment due to lack of a validated ageing method. The utility of the current sampling and its level should be re-evaluated.	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN	Belgium supports the idea to investigate the current sampling and its level. Belgium will look into the current level of sampling before the 31st of October. If adjustemnets are needed, this will be communicated through an adjustment of the National Program. If there is a possibility to initiate a validation of the ageing method, BE would be in favor to be involved in this.	MS reply is acceptable General comment not addressed to any MS in particular	Satisfactory
1155	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	hom-nsea: When considering the potential mixing of Western and North Sea horse mackerel in Division VIId, better information on the biological origin of catches from that area would greatly improve the quality of future scientific advice and, consequently, management of the North Sea horse mackerel stock.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Belgium agrees this, but it is unclear if this now the case or if this to implemented for upcoming ICES Data Calls?	MS reply is acceptable.Â This is a generic comment - it is not addressed to Belgium specifically	Satisfactory
1198	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	mac-nea: Limited sampling for discards has been carried out since 2000, despite a formal requirement initiated in the EU in 2002. Estimating the discarded and slipped proportions of catch is problematic in pelagic fisheries due to high variability in discard and slipping practices. In some fleets no sampling for discards is carried out, including those fleets for which discarding is illegal. The discards included in the catch in the assessment are an underestimate.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This is a general comment however, the comment is not very relevant for BE. BE has no pelagic fisheries and does not target mackerel. Catches of mackerel are limited (cfr data of BE in Intercatch).	MS reply acceptable	Satisfactory
1253	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WBGIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	anp-78ab: An increase in the discard sampling level is necessary for providing catch advice.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Belgium does not fully agree with this comment. In 2013= 15 trips were sampled, 359 hauls of which 234 conatined MON (65%)	MS reply is acceptable.Â Belgium has minor landing from this stock.Â WG's should specify in the summary sheets, which MS's the comments are directed at, and what remedial action is expected, to avoid all MS's having a perceived non - compliance issue	Satisfactory

## BELGIUM

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1278	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	anp-78ab: Accurate estimates of growth parameters are needed to facilitate the development of an analytical assessment	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This seems to a general comment directed to all MS involved in this stock. It is unclear what is expected from the MS.	MS reply is acceptable.Â Belgium has minor landing from this stock.Â WG's should specify in the summary sheets, which MS's the comments are directed at, and what remedial action is expected, to avoid all MS's having a perceived non - compliance issue	Satisfactory
1296	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	ple-89a: There are concerns about the reliability of the 20087%–2009 French data. Landings statistics need to be quality assured and confirmed for the region, and associated effort should be compiled.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This comment applies to France, not to BE	MS reply is acceptable.Â The comment is for France, not Belgium	Satisfactory
1300	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	anp-78ab: Reliable estimates of discards are not available	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This looks like a general comment directed to all MS involved in this stock. It is unclear what is expected from the MS.	MS reply is acceptable.Â WG's should specify in the summary sheets, which MS's the comments are directed at, and what remedial action is expected, to avoid all MS's having a perceived non - compliance issue	Satisfactory
1419	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	whg-89a: There are concerns about the reliability of the 20087%–2009 French data. Landings statistics need to be quality assured and confirmed for the region.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This comment applies to France, not to BE	MS reply is acceptable.Â This comment is for France to address - does not apply to Belgium	Satisfactory
1461	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	bss-8ab: Historical sampling of the commercial catches is of variable quality and data sampling should cover all fleets involved in this fishery. Time-series of relative abundance indices are needed for both the adult and pre-recruit components of the stock	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This is a general comment directed to all MS involved in this stock. It is unclear what is expected from the MS. In October 2014, there was a separate data call by EU services on catches ok sea bass and all data requested were delivered.	MS reply is acceptable.Â WG's should specify in the summary sheets, which MS's the comments are directed at, and what remedial action is expected, to avoid all MS's having a perceived non - compliance issue	Satisfactory
1465	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	bss-8ab: Recreational fisheries are likely to contribute substantially to fishery removals in some areas. Time-series of catches, releases, and size/age composition are needed from this component of the fishery to improve the assessment and advice.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	In Belgium, there is no license system in place for recreational fisheries which makes it uttermote difficult to investigate what the contibution is of the recreational fisheries of sea bass to the total catch. Belgium has currently a project running called "LIVIS" in which a full investigation is done of the Belgian recreational fisheries at sea and inshore. These data will be available for the National Program and could hopefully give more reliable information on the catces of sea bass by recreational fisheries in Belgium.	If the LIVIS reportÂ indicates a significant recreational fishery for sea bass, then Belgium must ensure that this fishery is sampled sufficiently.	Satisfactory

## BELGIUM

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1025	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	cod-347d: The Danish REX, UK northeast coast, and UK whitefish surveys have all been discontinued due to lack of funding. Such surveys require sustained support for at least five years in order for their outputs to be considered for inclusion in stock assessments as time-series indices.	MEDIUM	QUALITY	This is specifically for surveys in DK and UK. The issue is not relevant for Belgium as they are not involved in this surveys. BE does support the idea that such surveys should be continued, however Be cannot contribute to this surveys.	MS reply is acceptable. This comment is not directed at Belgium	Satisfactory
1033	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	cod-347d: Unaccounted removals are no longer estimated for 2006 onwards. The main sources of uncertainty are aspects of the input data (historical landings and discards; discrepancies between stock trends implied by the age structure of the commercial catch and surveys) and the assumption of fishing mortality and recruitment in the advice forecast. SSB has been overestimated in previous years.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This is a general comment directed to all MS involved in this stock. It is unclear what is expected from the MS.	MS answer is acceptable. Such very general statement from the WG is very difficult to comment on in relation to a specific country. Agreed coordinated actions must be implemented through future data calls. This type of issue has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1064	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	fle-nsea: Landings data are not complete before 1998, and are probably not indicative of catches. Discards should be estimated and added to the landings.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Discard data are since a few years available, but seem not be included?	Belgium to clarify if discard estimates were submitted to WGNSSK - particularly important for the Belgium beam trawlers (TBB_DEF_70_99_0_0)	Unsatisfactory
1069	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	fle-nsea: The mixed TAC with dab reduces the accuracy of catch statistics per species. International sampling effort for this species is at a very low level as only the Netherlands is collecting data. An increase in sampling intensity should be considered.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This comment is unclear. MS assumes it is about the combined landings of FLE and DAB. This will implicate that with the data raising, the landings will need to be split in an artificial way. MS would appreciate guidelines how to do this in the best way. Since 2013, Belgium samples fle as well, however in the final data call not all data were requested.	MS answer is acceptable. Such very general statement from the WG is very difficult to comment on in relation to a specific country. Agreed coordinated actions must be implemented through future data calls. This type of issue has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1075	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	gug-347d: Species misidentification continues to be a major problem in estimating the landings of all gurnards and hence grey gurnard. In addition, discarding is estimated to be high	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This is a general comment directed to all MS involved in this stock. It is unclear what is expected from the MS.	MS answer is acceptable. Such very general statement from the WG is very difficult to comment on in relation to a specific country. Agreed coordinated actions must be implemented through future data calls. This type of issue has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1210	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCSE. EcoRegion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland	mgw-78: Assessment data arrived after the ICES data call deadline, thus reducing time to review and audit the assessment results.	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Belgium has always been dependent of the administration for receiving the landings data and logbook data. These data were often only delivered to the stock assessment experts between end of March and halfway April. Once these data are received, there is still time needed to check the quality and to use the data before it can be sent to ICES. From 2015, Belgium has direct access to the data of the administration, which eases the use of these data. This can be seen already in the ICES data Call 2015, for which the requested deadlines have been reached by Belgium.	MSs should ensure that data call deadlines are respected. However Belgium indicates that the reason for the late submission of Belgian data has been resolved and should not occur from 2015 onwards	Satisfactory



## BELGIUM

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1221	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGMIXFISH-ADVICE. EcoRegion: North Sea	mix-fish: Mixed-fisheries analysis and projections critically rely on data being available on time to allow sufficient quality checking and preparation. Some data were submitted only shortly before the meeting, which limited the possibilities for additional data investigations.	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Belgium has always been dependent of the administration for receiving the landings data and logbook data. These data were often only delivered to the stock assessment experts between end of March and halfway April. Once these data are received, there is still time needed to check the quality and to use the data before it can be sent to ICES. From 2015 , Belgium has direct access to the data of the administration, which eases the use of these data. This can be seen already in the ICES data Call 2015, for which the requested deadlines have been reached by Belgium.	MSs should ensure that data call deadlines are respected. However Belgium indicates that the reason for the late submission of Belgian data has been resolved and should not occur from 2015 onwards	Satisfactory
1224	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	mur-347d: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	Belgium has always been dependent of the administration for receiving the landings data and logbook data. These data were often only delivered to the stock assessment experts between end of March and halfway April. Once these data are received, there is still time needed to check the quality and to use the data before it can be sent to ICES. From 2015 , Belgium has direct access to the data of the administration, which eases the use of these data. This can be seen already in the ICES data Call 2015, for which the requested deadlines have been reached by Belgium.	MSs should ensure that data call deadlines are respected. However Belgium indicates that the reason for the late submission of Belgian data has been resolved and should not occur from 2015 onwards	Satisfactory
1258	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	nep-33: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	Belgium has always been dependent of the administration for receiving the landings data and logbook data. These data were often only delivered to the stock assessment experts between end of March and halfway April. Once these data are received, there is still time needed to check the quality and to use the data before it can be sent to ICES. From 2015 , Belgium has direct access to the data of the administration, which eases the use of these data. This can be seen already in the ICES data Call 2015, for which the requested deadlines have been reached by Belgium.	MSs should ensure that data call deadlines are respected. However Belgium indicates that the reason for the late submission of Belgian data has been resolved and should not occur from 2015 onwards	Satisfactory
1263	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	nep-5: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	Belgium has always been dependent of the administration for receiving the landings data and logbook data. These data were often only delivered to the stock assessment experts between end of March and halfway April. Once these data are received, there is still time needed to check the quality and to use the data before it can be sent to ICES. From 2015 , Belgium has direct access to the data of the administration, which eases the use of these data. This can be seen already in the ICES data Call 2015, for which the requested deadlines have been reached by Belgium.	MSs should ensure that data call deadlines are respected. However Belgium indicates that the reason for the late submission of Belgian data has been resolved and should not occur from 2015 onwards	Satisfactory
1290	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCSE. EcoRegion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland	ple-7h-k: The assessment is carried out on the landings in Divisions VIIjk and there is no information other than landings from the component in Division VIIh of the TAC area. ICES is unable to assess stock trends in Division VIIh.	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	This seems to be a general comment directed to all MS involved in this stock. It is unclear what is expected from the MS. Belgium has limited landings of ple-7h-k.	MS reply is acceptable. WGs should specify in the summary sheets, which MSs the comments are directed at, and what remedial action is expected, to avoid all MSs having a perceived non - compliance issue	Satisfactory
1301	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland	ple-eche: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	Belgium has always been dependent of the administration for receiving the landings data and logbook data. These data were often only delivered to the stock assessment experts between end of March and halfway April. Once these data are received, there is still time needed to check the quality and to use the data before it can be sent to ICES. From 2015 , Belgium has direct access to the data of the administration, which eases the use of these data. This can be seen already in the ICES data Call 2015, for which the requested deadlines have been reached by Belgium.	MSs should ensure that data call deadlines are respected. However Belgium indicates that the reason for the late submission of Belgian data has been resolved and should not occur from 2015 onwards	Satisfactory

BELGIUM										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1303	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	ple-eche: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	Belgium has always been dependent of the administration for receieving the landings data and logbook data. These data were often only delivered to the stock assesment experts between end of March and halfway April. Once these data are recieved, there is still time neded to check the quality and to use the data before it can be sent to ICES. From 2015 , Belgium has direct access to the data of the adminstraion, which eases the use of these data. This can be seen already in the ICES data Call 2015, for which the requested deadlines have been reached by Belgium.	MSs should ensure that data call deadlines are respected. However Belgium indicates that the reason for the late submission of Belgian data has been resolved and should not occur from 2015 onwards	Satisfactory
1311	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	ple-nsea: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	Belgium has always been dependent of the administration for receieving the landings data and logbook data. These data were often only delivered to the stock assesment experts between end of March and halfway April. Once these data are recieved, there is still time neded to check the quality and to use the data before it can be sent to ICES. From 2015 , Belgium has direct access to the data of the adminstraion, which eases the use of these data. This can be seen already in the ICES data Call 2015, for which the requested deadlines have been reached by Belgium.	MSs should ensure that data call deadlines are respected. However Belgium indicates that the reason for the late submission of Belgian data has been resolved and should not occur from 2015 onwards	Satisfactory
1374	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	sol-eche: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	Belgium has always been dependent of the administration for receieving the landings data and logbook data. These data were often only delivered to the stock assesment experts between end of March and halfway April. Once these data are recieved, there is still time neded to check the quality and to use the data before it can be sent to ICES. From 2015 , Belgium has direct access to the data of the adminstraion, which eases the use of these data. This can be seen already in the ICES data Call 2015, for which the requested deadlines have been reached by Belgium.	MSs should ensure that data call deadlines are respected. However Belgium indicates that the reason for the late submission of Belgian data has been resolved and should not occur from 2015 onwards	Satisfactory
1380	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	sol-nsea: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	Belgium has always been dependent of the administration for receieving the landings data and logbook data. These data were often only delivered to the stock assesment experts between end of March and halfway April. Once these data are recieved, there is still time neded to check the quality and to use the data before it can be sent to ICES. From 2015 , Belgium has direct access to the data of the adminstraion, which eases the use of these data. This can be seen already in the ICES data Call 2015, for which the requested deadlines have been reached by Belgium.	MSs should ensure that data call deadlines are respected. However Belgium indicates that the reason for the late submission of Belgian data has been resolved and should not occur from 2015 onwards	Satisfactory
1402	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	tur-nsea: The collection of data needs to be continued in order to get a better understanding of the state of turbot stocks in the Northeast Atlantic. Priority should be given to improvement of catch-at-age information available from different countries and fleets. A fisheries independent index of abundance covering the whole stock area would improve the assessment of this stock.	HIGH	QUALITY	The sampling of turbot is expensive. The Belgian fishermen do not allow turbot to be manipulated for cutting otoliths. Whole fish need to be bought, and as is known, turbot has a high economic value. From a budget perspective, a MS has to maintain priorities and unfortunately, buying turbot in amount enough for having enough data, is too expensive.	ICES comment is too general. MS answer is acceptable. However, as Belgium has a large percentage of turbot catches effort should be made improve access to catch-at-age data.	Satisfactory
1431	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNEW. EcoRegion: North Sea	gug-347d, pol-celt, pol-nsea: landings were not submitted to the data submission deadline, but until the 1st workshop WGNEW dat	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Belgium has always been dependent of the administration for receieving the landings data and logbook data. These data were often only delivered to the stock assesment experts between end of March and halfway April. Once these data are recieved, there is still time neded to check the quality and to use the data before it can be sent to ICES. From 2015 , Belgium has direct access to the data of the adminstraion, which eases the use of these data. This can be seen already in the ICES data Call 2015, for which the requested deadlines have been reached by Belgium.	MSs should ensure that data call deadlines are respected. However Belgium indicates that the reason for the late submission of Belgian data has been resolved and should not occur from 2015 onwards	Satisfactory

## BELGIUM

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1448	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	bll-nsea: Fishery-independent surveys catch very few large brill, creating data gaps for the greater fish lengths. Commercial surveys could be developed to effectively monitor the full age and size spectrum of this species.	MEDIUM	QUALITY	The sampling of brill, just like turbot, is expensive. The Belgian fishermen do not allow brill to be manipulated for cutting otoliths. Whole fish need to be bought, and as is known, brill has a high economic value. From a budget perspective, a MS has to maintain priorities and unfortunately, buying brill in amount enough for having enough data, is too expensive.	MS answer is acceptable. ICES comment is too general and should not be addressed as an data transmission failure. This type of issues has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1457	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCSE. EcoRegion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland	bss-47: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGCSE data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	Belgium has always been dependent of the administration for receiving the landings data and logbook data. These data were often only delivered to the stock assessment experts between end of March and halfway April. Once these data are received, there is still time needed to check the quality and to use the data before it can be sent to ICES. From 2015 , Belgium has direct access to the data of the administration, which eases the use of these data. This can be seen already in the ICES data Call 2015, for which the requested deadlines have been reached by Belgium.	MSs should ensure that data call deadlines are respected. However Belgium indicates that the reason for the late submission of Belgian data has been resolved and should not occur from 2015 onwards	Satisfactory
1513	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	cod-347d: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	Belgium has always been dependent of the administration for receiving the landings data and logbook data. These data were often only delivered to the stock assessment experts between end of March and halfway April. Once these data are received, there is still time needed to check the quality and to use the data before it can be sent to ICES. From 2015 , Belgium has direct access to the data of the administration, which eases the use of these data. This can be seen already in the ICES data Call 2015, for which the requested deadlines have been reached by Belgium.	MSs should ensure that data call deadlines are respected. However Belgium indicates that the reason for the late submission of Belgian data has been resolved and should not occur from 2015 onwards	Satisfactory

BULGARIA										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf_assessment
339	JRC	2014	Aquaculture		BG only reported data by segment for 2012. The Bulgarian aquaculture production represents a smallportion of the EU total and has been excluded from the time series analyses on species and techniques.	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Thank you very much for informing us.	According to the NP the aquaculture data is collected by segment since 2009, therefor should be reported by segment. Bulgaria has to report data by segment for 2009-2011. The comment from the end user is not self-explanatory and doesn't identify the issue.	Unsatisfactory
383	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Significant amount of missing and inconsistent data for several fleet segments . Impact: Incomplete times series, national and EU analyses	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Since the questionnaires that were used until 2013 were anonymous, we have not had the opportunity to do absolutely correct the separation of fishing techniques.	Data collection methodology should allow matching the economic information, obtained from questionnaires, with the fleet segment in which the vessel is classified. The answer from MS is not satisfactory and solving the issue.	Unsatisfactory
384	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Energy consumption missing for 2012 at MS level; missing for 2011 and 2012 at fleet segment level. Impact: Incomplete times series, national and EU analyses	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Energy consumption is available in the questionnaires for 2013 and it was reported on 14.04.2015	Submission for DCF is mandatory for all variables and segments unless MS has derogation. MS also reported collection of fuel consumption by segment for 2011 and 2012 in the relevant ARs.	Unsatisfactory
385	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Highly questionable employment (2011 and 2012) and effort data (2012). Impact: Incomplete times series, national and EU analyses	HIGH	COVERAGE	Employment is different because in 2011 and 2012 were used various sources of information.	MS reply does not explain the low quality of data on employment and effort. No justification is given for the change of data collection methodology and no actions for improvement are reported. The issue raised by the end user is also not clear.	Unsatisfactory
386	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		National level capacity data provided for the active fleet only; data on inactive vessels missing, inconsistent with fleet segment level data . Impact: Suggests incomplete coverage of the DCF data submitted; inconsistent data and time series; data manipulation is needed to correct errors	HIGH	UNKNOWN	From 2013 we have included inactive ships from all segments.	The issue raised by the end user is not clear. Therefore it is not possible to assess if it is data transmission failure, or interpretation of the data call. It seems that information about inactive vessels is not missing, but not included in the national total reported.	Unknown
387	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Depreciated replacement values not provided for 2012, instead depreciated historical value was provided; however, there are significant differences between the two values in 2009 and 2010. Impact: Incomplete/inconsistent time series, national, EU and regional analyses; unreliable performance estimates	HIGH	COVERAGE	In the past years we have not had the opportunity to analyze Depreciated replacement value and Annual depreciation. We will try to correct this problem in the next report.	Submission for DCF is mandatory for all variables and segments unless MS has derogation. According to Bulgarian NP and AR 2013 depreciated replacement value for 2012 is collected.	Unsatisfactory
388	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Capital value not provided for inactive vessels. Impact: Incomplete economic, time-series and national fleet analysis	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Data for inactive vessels is not applicable.	MS answer is not correct. According to DCF, capital value and capital costs have to be provided for inactive vessels.	Unsatisfactory
389	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Income and expenditure data highly questionable. Impact: Unreliability of estimated economic indicators	HIGH	COVERAGE	Fleet Economic data was extrapolated.	The answer from MS is not clear and therefore the issue is considered as not addressed by the MS.	Unsatisfactory
390	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Inconsistent clustering over the time period. Impact: Incomplete/inaccurate times series analyses	HIGH	COVERAGE	Since the questionnaires that were used until 2013 were anonymous, we have not had the opportunity to do absolutely correct the separation of fishing techniques.	MS comment seems not related with the issue and also addressed in the assessm	Unknown



BULGARIA										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
486	JRC	2014	Processing		No information on enterprises carrying out fish processing not as a main activity. The values provided for the variable 'purchase of fish and other raw material for production' are very low compared with those for 'turnover'. Although the national correspondent for Bulgaria has confirmed that all the information provided were correct, the experts continued to find the consistency of the data provided questionable.	LOW	UNKNOWN	In Bulgaria there are 50 enterprises, we have available information only for 10 of them.	There is no explanation and justification from MS regarding failure of data delivery. Comment on low quality questionable data is not sufficient. MS have to put more effort to increase response rate.	Unsatisfactory
3	GFCM	2014	[ None ]	Task 1.2	48% completed -missing data for fishing zones (20% competed), operational units (56%) and fishing periods (24%)	LOW	COVERAGE	All available data are submitted.	MS answer can be considered acceptable. For the future MS should try to fulfil at least the requested information on fishing zone (it could coincide with the GSA) and fishing periods. The end user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies	Unknown
4	GFCM	2014	[ None ]	Task 1.4	29% completed - no data on discard value, by-catch weight and by-catch number (0%), missing data on fishing periods (24%) and CPUE of main associated species(29%)	MEDIUM	COVERAGE	All available data are submitted.	MS answer is acceptable. Missing information (especially on bycatch regarding weight and number, and/or the CPUE/LPUE value of main associated species) could be related to the mismatch of the DCF metier concept and the GFCM data requests at the level of operational units. Such problems are recurring for many Mediterranean and Black Sea countries and should be solved once the new GFCM DCRF comes into force. The end user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies	Unknown
5	GFCM	2014	[ None ]	Task 1.5	All Task 1.5 data- not provided (0%)	HIGH	COVERAGE	All available data are submitted.	Issue to be investigated by DGMARE (MS states that data was submitted as requested, this can not be verified by EWG).	Unknown
6	GFCM	2014	[ None ]	Submission deadline	all task 1 data submitted up to 1 month late (6/06/2014)	LOW	TIMELINESS	Sorry for any inconvenience caused.	The delay can be considered acceptable. Should be remarked that all Task 1 data are not used by any working groups, but are only stored in the GFCM database. However, MS should try to submit the data respecting the established deadline.	Satisfactory
7	ICCAT	2014	[ None ]	T2SW/CAS: Catch-at size	no data on small tuna species (various fleets)	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	No data are available for these species.	If all large pelagic species (not mentioned by end user!!), and hence the requested data, are not present in the country, the answer given by MS can be considered acceptable.	Unknown

## BULGARIA

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
453	JRC	2014	Med and BS		Effort submitted for 2013 is extremely low	HIGH	COVERAGE	Effort was calculated based on the number of vessels fishing for species listed in Landing and Catch.	Answer cannot be accepted. Answer given by MS is not clear. Have been checked and thereafter resubmitted the requested data?	Unsatisfactory
454	JRC	2014	Med and BS		Catch at Age (Table A) and Catch at Length (Table B) data are missing for all species submitted. Only total landings were provided.	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Research surveys were not conducted for these indicators in 2013.	MS has explained that the non-implementation of the survey caused different problems, and a series of data could not be submitted to the different end-users. DGMARE should decide on this issue.	Unknown
455	JRC	2014	Med and BS		Landings for Anchovy, Striped red mullet and Rapa whelk are missing or are questionable	HIGH	UNKNOWN	All available data are submitted.	MS answer can be considered acceptable assuming that MS has sent correctly the data. End user should verify, and reports to DGMARE, if during the forthcoming data call all requested data would be available.Â	Unknown
456	JRC	2014	Med and BS		Survey data for 2013 was not submitted since surveys were not performed, data from prior years was not sent. Technically not resending the data is like retracting the time series submitted in 2013.	HIGH	UNKNOWN	There were no research surveys in 2013.	MS has explained that the non-implementation of the surveys (in 2013) caused different problems, and a series of data couldnâ€™t be submitted to the different end-users. DGMARE should decide on this issue.Â MS should upload also the previous years set of data.	Unknown

## CROATIA

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
391	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Questionable income data at National total level (error in estimation procedure). Impact: Inconsistent data; incomplete times series and national analysis; overestimation of economic indicators at MS level	HIGH	COVERAGE	As a new Member State, Croatia was not obliged to submit fleet economic data for the years 2008-2013, and its nationally-funded data collection in that period included primarily catch and effort data, as well as key biological data collection. Although 2013 was the first year of implementation of DCF in Croatia, in 2014 Croatia delivered data for 2011 and 2012 as to resolve inconsistencies in methodology and to establish a time series in order to compare data. This exercise proved useful especially to detect possible issues and resolve them at the level of raw data, aggregated data and estimation of fleet totals. For income, several inconsistencies were detected at the level of questionnaires and correction procedure was set up. The result is corrected data at the level of questionnaires, revised estimation procedures and consequently more reliable data delivered for the data call in 2015. Additionally, the methodology to estimate landing income was reviewed and changed. Transversal data is now used to estimate landings income and represents the landings weight multiplied by average prices derived from sales notes. In this regard, a methodology to estimate average prices was previously implemented. Based on the above mentioned, data for 2012 and 2013 was delivered for the data call in 2015 and more reliable results are expected.	Croatia acknowledges the problems in estimation procedures and in general in the methodolgy applied for the estimation of economic variables.. However, comment by end user should be more precise in assessing data quality and end user should also consider that Croatia was not obliged to submit data for the years 2008-2013	Satisfactory
392	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Questionable employment (FTE) data 2011 and 2012 (error in estimation procedure). Impact: Inconsistent data; incomplete times series and national analysis	HIGH	COVERAGE	In 2014 Croatia reviewed data for 2011-2013. Employment data was checked at the level of raw data in questionnaires as well as database procedures to estimate totals. Although there were some inconsistencies at the questionnaire level, which were resolved, estimation procedures were correctly implemented. However, number of vessels was added as a rising factor to estimate totals. As a result estimates of total employed and FTE for 2012 and 2013 have improved and are considerably more reliable.	Croatia acknowledges the problems in estimation procedures. However, comment by end user should be more precise in assessing data quality and end user should also consider that Croatia was not obliged to submit data for the years 2008-2013	Satisfactory
393	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Incomplete data sets for several fleet segments (e.g. DRB VL0612, FPO VL0006, FPO VL0612, etc.) . Impact: Incomplete national fleet segment analyses	HIGH	UNKNOWN	In 2014 Croatia, data for 2013 as well as 2012 was collected in order to reach better estimations. In cases where response rate was still inadequate to reach a statistically sound estimation, a simple regression was used to estimate totals. This is typically a problem of data collection for the small scale fleet, for which questionnaire return rate is low, data in questionnaires inconsistent, unreliable and sometimes unreadable as in most cases there is no professional accounting. To tackle this issues, considerably more effort was placed into data collection in 2014 for the fisherman involved in small scale fisheries, including direct contact, reviewing questionnaires, cross checking data etc. As a result, in 2015 more complete data sets for 2012 and 2013 were delivered, expecting higher quality and more reliable results.	Croatia acknowledges the difficulties in estimating economic variables for the small scale fleets. Specific measures have been taken to avoid these problems starting from 2015 data submission. However, 2013 data have been trasmitted with incomplete data sets for several segments	Unsatisfactory
394	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Inconsistent clustering over the time period. Impact: Incomplete/inaccurate times series analyses	HIGH	COVERAGE	Several issues were detected as regards fleet segmentation and clustering. To tackle this issues Croatia has reviewed the procedures and methodologies for fleet segmentation and clustering. The following was resolved:1. Â Mapping from national codes to codes used in the DCF reporting tables: Although Croatia is fully in line with FAO coding, some codes are missing in the reporting tables which are not fully aligned to the Master Data Register codes as some codes are missing from the list in the reporting tables. In order to be able to deliver data, trans codes for some gears and fishing techniques were used.2. Fleet segmentation procedures: In Croatia fleet segmentation is done using an SQL procedure which was reviewed in 2014. Several issues connected to data mapping, allocation of fishing time to gears, and aggregation methods were tackled and resolved. For the period 2011-2014 fleet was re-segmented in 2015 and data for the 2015 data call was delivered according to the new segmentation and clustering.3. Short time series: At the time of data submission in 2014, Croatia hadn't had a long enough time series in order to reach a sound conclusion on stable fleet segments through the observed period.4. Clustering: Fleet segment and vessel clustering in Croatia is done for two reasons: sampling purposes or reporting purposes for confidentiality reasons. As clustering depends entirely on the activity of vessels, in cases where clustering is needed, vessel activity is reviewed on a vessel to vessel case. In cases where a vessel changes its activity from one year to another inconsistently, it is directly reflected in the clustering. In the future other factors, such as landings weight/value or even a fishing pattern in a longer time period, could be taken into account when clustering such vessels, in order to get more homogeneous fleet segments and estimations with less variability. Clustering in order to keep time series could also be taken into account.	The first year of implementation of Croatian NP was 2103. Therefore, the issue of inconsistent clustering over the time period is not completely appropriate. In addition, MS reply is detailed and shows a good knowledge on the issue of clustering.	Satisfactory

CROATIA										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
8	GFCM	2014	[ None ]	Task 1.4	61% completed - no data on discard value, group by-catch species, by-catch weight and by-catch number (0%)	LOW	COVERAGE	Data on by-catch and discard data for referent years 2013 will be provided in 2015. More detailed data is to be expected in the near future as per MSFD provisions as information on by-catch shall be requested within the e-logbook. As the discard plan for small pelagic species has been developed and adopted in 2014, applying as of 1st January 2015 as per the Basic Regulation of the CFP, it is expected that the results of the SCIP that is covering this segment shall further enhance and secure the quality and availability of data. Discards were only estimated and very unreliable as sporadic data was available from logbooks, which made it difficult to estimate values and extrapolate figures on a fleet segment level. Croatia is correcting this error by increasing the number of controls in terms of logbook information on discards and obligation to record all discards. However, it should be noted that discarding was not a common practice in the Mediterranean nor in Croatian fisheries as such. In implementation of stricter provisions on controls of recording and landing all species under the discard ban Croatia intends to strengthen and improve data quality.	MS answer is acceptable. The end user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies	Unknown
9	GFCM	2014	[ None ]	Task 1.5	All Task 1.5 data - not provided (0%)	HIGH	COVERAGE	Biological data for referent year 2013 will be provided in 2015. Comprehensive data requested within Task 1.5 is not available for 2012 data as only a pilot study for biological parameters was conducted in that year in order to prepare for DCF member state obligations in 2013. Also, processing of data collected prior to 2012 was done using different approach which resulted in erroneous and dubious results, and data was not structured in the manner that matched the requirements. Croatia is aware of this shortfall, and has put significant effort into resolving it. It is expected that in 2015 data call this shall not represent an issue.	MS answer is acceptable.Ā	Satisfactory
10	GFCM	2014	[ None ]	Submission deadline	All task 1 data submitted 6.5 months late (16/12/2014)	HIGH	TIMELINESS	Croatia delivered DCF data for the first time in 2014. Since the analysis of data revealed some remaining methodological issues, during 2014 and in the beginning of 2015 Croatia checked and reviewed essentially all database and estimation procedures. As a result a central DCF database was restructured and the process is ongoing. As the central DCF database is also used for GFCM reporting, time was needed to develop and test data query and methodological procedures for the GFCM Task 1 reporting. This resulted in a delay in submission of data, but guaranteed the best possible quality of the submission (with checked and modified procedures used and data verified). Croatia is aware of this delay, and all procedures were set in place in order to guarantee that delays should not happen in the future. All the changes made and routines developed/checked guarantee that timeliness shall no longer represent an issue.	The explanation given by MS can be considered acceptable. Should be remarked that all Task 1 data are not used by any working groups, but are only stored in the GFCM database. However, for the future, MS should try to submit the data respecting the established deadline.Ā	Satisfactory
11	ICCAT	2014	[ None ]	T2SW/CAS: Catch-at size	no data on albacore and swordfish and small tunas for all gear groups (HL and LL fleets)	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	In 2013, as part of the ST05 report an analysis of length and weight BFT classes was delivered to ICCAT. Given that SWO and ALB fishery is not a targeted fishery in Croatia, as opposed to the BFT, significantly more effort was placed in collecting the relevant data for that species. Catches of SWO are sporadic, making sampling an catch-at-size reporting and verification highly demanding. Due to a mismatch between the sampling scheme and actual landings of SWO and ALB in 2013 catch-at-size sampling was not possible. Croatia is aware of this commission, and has put additional efforts into matching of the sampling scheme and the activities. Within the DCF six specimens of SWO were analysed and the T2SW report can be sent subsequently.	MS answer can be considered acceptable	Satisfactory
457	JRC	2014	Med and BS		Catch/Landings data include only 9 species.	HIGH	UNKNOWN	In standard table ST III.E.3 stocks for sampling are listed for the implementation year 2014. Nine species are listed for sampling while for the other species, in the national programme a derogation was listed. Therefore, 9 species were selected for monitoring according to landing, effort and value. For other G1 and G2 species included in the MEDITS protocol, data was submitted according to the MedBS data call.	MS answer can be considered acceptable	Satisfactory
458	JRC	2014	Med and BS		Effort data and Catch data (Landings, Discards) are inconsistent: large effort values in some years-areas-gears are accompanied by very low or no catches at all	HIGH	COVERAGE	Since the MedBS data call regarding effort and landings requires essentially the same data but in a different format as the economic data call, there was insufficient time to also develop and check data query procedures in the period between the two data calls. Effort and catch data aggregation procedures were reviewed in 2014, together with the fleet segmentation review. As a result, database procedures were modified which resulted in more consistent effort and catch data. Data for 2014 will be delivered according to the revised procedures.	MS answer can be considered mostly acceptable. However, in order to avoid any problem (e.g. discrepancies, inconsistencies), for the next data call MS should resubmit not only 2014 but also the effort and catch data related to the previous year (end user should verify it)	Unsatisfactory



## CROATIA

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
459	JRC	2014	Med and BS		Officially submitted sardine landings data was not used during the STECF EWG 14-17; experts identified them as incorrect and used their own 'correct' data	HIGH	COVERAGE	The error in officially submitted data was detected in the course of STECF EWG 14-17 exercise, and as such identified and corrected on the spot by the experts which were also responsible for data collection and reporting in the member state. STECF has been informed immediately as soon as the error was discovered, so corrected data were used in STECF EWG 14-17. Upon review, a data managing error was discovered. In 2015, methodological and administrative procedures are set-up to ensure that this kind of error does not repeat.	MS answer can be considered mostly acceptable. However, in order to avoid any problem (e.g. discrepancies, inconsistencies), for the next data call MS should resubmit, correctly, the complete set of data (i.e sardine landing)	Satisfactory
460	JRC	2014	Med and BS		MEDITS data only for 2013 (the survey is conducted ,since 1994 in GSA 17 but Croatia entered the EU in 2013 data were not sent to JRC)	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Croatia performed the MEDITS survey from 1996 in GSA 17 jointly with Italy using Italian research vessel. All data from 1996 to 2012 were pooled and regularly sent by the Italian coordinator for GSA 17. Croatia submitted MEDITS data for 2013 in a data call as it became the member state in that year. In all previous years HR MEDITS data were made available directly to the end user, by way of Italian coordinator for GSA 17.Â	It seems that Croatian data have been sent to the Italian coordinator for GSA 17 but not directly to JRC. Croatia is invited to submit data pertaining to Medits 1996-2012 surveys directly to JRC. However, it has to be born in mind that Croatia entered the EU only in 2013. Thus the evaluation of AR can only address data collection issues occurring from that time onwards.	Satisfactory

CYPRUS										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
12	GFCM	2014	[ None ]	Task 1.2	58% completed -no data on fishing zones (0%) and missing data on main associated species (34%)	LOW	COVERAGE	<p>Cyprus has received from GFCM Secretariat, upon request, the detailed tables based on which the % of coverage on each Task has been calculated. We are grateful for receiving the tables, and we can explain now the reasons for the coverage shortfalls. Concerning Task 1.2, the basic reason for which there is not 100% coverage is because of lack of consistency on the naming of operational units between the different tables of Task 1. Instead, Operational Units are presented with different (similar) gear class / target species (e.g. the target group of the sameÂ fleet segment is given in 3 different codes: "miscellaneous", "miscellaneous coastal species" and "miscellaneous demersal species"). Cyprus is willing to correct the submitted data, and commits in the future to avoid any inconsistencies among the tables submitted to GFCM. Concerning the fishing zones, indeed Cyprus has not provided any text in the relevant field and will provide it in the future. Regarding missing data on main associated species, Cyprus has provided data concerning the 5 demersal/coastal species for which stock related biological parameters are collected under the National Data Collection Programme under DCF; such species are only in GSA 25 and not in the rest Operational Units recorded in previous tables. In the future, Cyprus could provideÂ the catches of main species in other GSAs, but the fields concerning length, sex and maturity would remain empty since they are not collected. In this case, we consider that the methodology used by GFCM for calculating the % of coverage could be modified. In addition, Cyprus has not provided data on large pelagic, since they are provided to ICCAT, but in the future also large pelagic data will be included in the table of main associated species, for covering the relevant Operational Units.</p>	<p>Answer given by MS is acceptable. Missing information (e.g. large pelagic) should be uploaded. Moreover, for the future MS should try to fulfill at least the requested information on fishing zone (it could coincide with the GSA). The problem linked with the main associated species should be solved once the new GFCM DCRF comes into force.</p>	Satisfactory
13	GFCM	2014	[ None ]	Task 1.4	44% complete - no data on total effort, catch or landing value,discard value, by-catch value of fishing periods, no data on catch/landing value and CPUE/LPUE vlaue of main associated species	LOW	COVERAGE	<p>Table OU_fishing Periods and Table OU_FP_MainAssoc by mistake were not completely filled in. In the future, tables will be filled in with more caution and coordination, for providing relevant data to all fields</p>	<p>As reported by the MS itself, if the table has not been completely filled in, it should be resubmitted with the appropriate correction (end user should confirm it)</p>	Unknown
14	GFCM	2014	[ None ]	Task 1.5	34% completed - missing data on maturity, sex and length	MEDIUM	COVERAGE	<p>As explained previously concerning Task 1.2, Cyprus collects maturity, sex and length data only on species of GSA 25 (and large pelagic). It is noted that the number of vessels targeting demersal species in other GSAs is limited (see relevant tables on operational units and fleet segments). . In the future, Cyprus will report to GFCM data on large pelagic (currently reported only to ICCAT), and also catch data on the main demersal species in the other GSAs.</p>	<p>The answer provided by MS is not clear. MS should report if data have been reported at least for the main commercial species in the country. Information on large pelagic, if available, should be included. The requested field, based only on the maturity scale used to determine the stage of maturity for that species, should be also reported. Â</p>	Unknown
15	GFCM	2014	[ None ]	Submission deadline	all task 1 data submitted 6 months late (25/11/2014)	HIGH	TIMELINESS	<p>Cyprus makes efforts for submitting task 1 data on time</p>	<p>Answer can be considered acceptable.Â However forÂ the future, MS should try to submit the data respecting the established deadline. Should be remarked that all Task 1 data are not used by any working groups but are only stored in the GFCM database. Â</p>	Unknown
16	ICCAT	2014	[ None ]	T1NC: Nominal Catches	no data on small tuna species (LL fleet)	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	<p>Small tuna species are not targeted by Cyprus fishing fleets. Catch data on such species are being collected and will be transmitted to ICCAT in the future. Cyprus will be happy to trasmit catches of small tuna for previous year.</p>	<p>MS answer can be considered acceptable assuming that MS will send the data. End user should verify if requested data will be correctly uploaded.</p>	Unsatisfactory
17	ICCAT	2014	[ None ]	T2SW/CAS: Catch-at size	no data on albacore (LL fleet)	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	<p>As stated in the Cyprus Annual Report concerning 2013, prepared within the DCF, a substantial reduction of the available budget for the implementation of the National Programme did not allow the usual sampling of large pelagic through sub-contracting. Instead, data collection for large pelagic was arranged to be done by inspectors of the Control Division of the Department of Fisheries and Marine Research (DFMR), during landing inspections. However, no sampling was achieved concerning metier LLD targeting ALB, and subsequently there were no measurements of albacore. This problem arouse only in 2013. Taking into account that from 2014 data collection is financed under the European Marine and Fisheries Fund (EMFF), it is considered that such shortfalls will be avoided in the future. In any case, â€œback-up actionsâ€ will be set for the future, in case subcontracting will not be possible (such as self-sampling by fishers and stock-specific sampling of large pelagic). For 2014-2015, sampling of large pelagic is carried out in accordance with the National Data Collection Programme and data on albacore are being collected.</p>	<p>MS answer is partially justified. 2013 data will not be available</p>	Unsatisfactory

CYPRUS										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
395	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Effort data not submitted for 2011 and 2012 - days at sea and 2012 - fishing days. Impact: Incomplete national analysis, EU and regional overviews	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Data not submitted have been incorporated in the 2015 data call. Effort is made to have complete data submissions.	Submission for DCF is mandatory for all variables and segments unless MS has a derogation. MS should take appropriate measures to prepare and provide the data in due time.	Unsatisfactory
396	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Energy consumption missing for 2011 and 2012. Impact: Incomplete national analysis, EU and regional overviews	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Despite the fact that energy costs was recorded and sent through the 2014 fleet economic data call the data for the variable energy consumption were not sent by mistake. These data are available and it is noted that they were sent in the fleet economic data of 2015.	Submission for DCF is mandatory for all variables and segments unless MS has a derogation. MS should take appropriate measures to prepare and provide the data in due time.	Unsatisfactory
397	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Average vessel age missing for 2008 and 2009 . Impact: Incomplete time series at national and EU level	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Data not submitted have been incorporated in the 2015 data call. Effort is made to have complete data submissions.	Submission for DCF is mandatory for all variables and segments unless MS has a derogation. MS should take appropriate measures to prepare and provide the data in due time.	Unsatisfactory
398	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Questionable data for fleet depreciated replacement value for the period 2009-2012 (grossly overestimated). Impact: Inconsistent national analysis, EU and regional overviews; over-estimation of capital costs	HIGH	COVERAGE	The value of fleet depreciated replacement value is estimated using some calculations. The workings used to estimate this variable will be checked for any mistakes.	MS provided insufficient justification. The issue of low quality data has not been properly addressed.	Unknown
399	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Substantial amount of data missing for the fleet segments PGO VL0006, PGO VL0612 and PG VL0006 (no info indicating clustered FS) . Impact: Inconsistent data; incomplete times series and national analysis	HIGH	UNKNOWN	No clustering for the PGO and PG category is taken place. Å Annual licences for the professional category PGO (Vessel length categories PGO 0006 and PGO 0612) were given for the first time in the middle of 2008 and the process for granting those licences lasted until 2009. Thus during the year 2010 the Department of Fisheries and Marine Research started collecting data for this category. Consequently, no data exist for the year 2008-2009. From the year 2010 and onwards the DFMR keeps records and collects data (data for employment, income, expenditure and so on). It is noted that these professional fishermen perform their fishing activity on a periodic basis since according to the new national legislation they are allowed to fishÅ Å only during the weekends and the national holidays, a total of 70 days each year. Most of the fish produced by this category of fishermen is kept for self-consumption. Consequently, their income from fisheries activities is too low, nearly zero. Å The data for PG 0006 and PG 0612 have been sent as requested.	Reasonable justification was provided by MS. The end-user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies. In this particular case it's not clear for which year data is missing.	Unknown
461	JRC	2014	Med and BS		No effort data for 2013. Effort is declared for many GSA's outside the Cypriot GSA25. However, no catches are declared outside GSA25.	HIGH	UNKNOWN	According to the JRC DCF Data Call Coverage Report for the Mediterranean and Black Sea in 2014, Cyprus submitted partial effort data (Nb of vessels) for 2013. The effort data not submitted concern KW *days and GT*days. According to Appendix VIII of Decision 2010/93/ EU, effort variables KW*days and GT*days are only required for Dredges and Trawls and not the gears for which effort data was submitted. Concerning the comment that no catches are declared outside GSA25, according to the Cyprus National Programme, length and age data of demersal species are collected only for species of GSA 25, therefore catches by length and age are only available for GSA 25.	The end-user should be more specific in defining the issues. Also the MS when preparing an answer should do it clearer.	Unknown
462	JRC	2014	Med and BS		Landings for some target species are given only in tons without any information by length class	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Information by length class is available for all target species. Attention will be given in the future for submitting all available length data, even when the relevant age data are submitted, and despite the fact that length data are rarely used for stock assessment when age data are available.	MS answer is not acceptable. MS should provide also the requested length data	Unsatisfactory

CYPRUS										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
463	JRC	2014	Med and BS	Effort data and Catch data (Landings, Discards) are inconsistent: large effort values in some years-areas-gears are accompanied by very low or no catches at all		HIGH	COVERAGE	The comment is very general, therefore a general reply is provided. As it is shown in the effort table, almost all vessels targeting demersal species are small scale vessels, with length less than 12m. These vessels catch various coastal demersal species, most of which are not included in the Data Call (e.g. Siganus spp., Sparisoma cretense). Through this data call it is not possible to review all catches from the Cyprus fleets, therefore it is not clear to Cyprus how this comment on inconsistency between effort and catch data was made. In addition, we wish to comment that indeed, the total catches of the small scale fleet are quite low. Furthermore, the effort file refers to vessels targeting large pelagic, which are not included in the species required in the data call; therefore there are no catches at all concerning this fleet. We will be happy to provide more clarifications, as we mentioned the comment is quite general.	MS answer is acceptable. Feedback on which data were inconsistent would be needed by end user (e.g. more clarifications on which gears is missing etc.)	Satisfactory
487	JRC	2014	Processing	The MS committed to collect data by segment according to the national program but did not provide it		LOW	UNKNOWN	Regarding the Collection of data concerning the processing industry the Member States should collect the parameters ofÂ Appendix XII of Commission Decision 2010/93/EU. We have not realisedÂ the above-mentioned comment about collecting data by segment. Please clarify further what do you mean by this comment.Â	MS provided relatively sufficient justification. In table IVB1 of NP, collection of economic variables is provided by two segments. Considering a small size of sector may arise confidentiality issues. The problem is repetitive for number of MS, when NP text do not indicate collection and submission by segment whereas table shows data collection by segments.	Satisfactory



DENMARK										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
400	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		No data reported for 2013 (national and fleet segment levels). Impact: Incomplete times series , national and EU overview	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Denmark has informed the CommissionÅ on this matter in e-mail 10-02-2014 and got the answer, that we are not obliged to report 2013 data in the 2014 report when the data is not available.	According to the NP the effort and landings data are ready for data provision in 4 months after the reference year, which means, that 2013 transversal data is only available after April. Economic data for 2013 is not collected by the data call. End user should be more specific identifying which variables are missing for 2013.	Satisfactory
401	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Capital value not provided for inactive vessels. Impact: Incomplete economic, time-series and national fleet analysis	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Denmark has previously answered to JRC on this matter before, which has to do with the zero values of â€inactive vesselsâ€. The register entity, which identifies an â€inactive vesselâ€, is evaluated to zero. The value is in the fishing rights. All individual rights to fish has been evaluated, and is included in the capital values.	Reasonable justification was provided by MS.	Satisfactory
402	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		GT fishing days and kWfishing days provided only for 2012. No impact	LOW	UNKNOWN	The variables â€tototKwFishDaysâ€ and â€tototGTFishDaysâ€ were reported on the EFFORT_TOT sheet and the EFFORT_GEAR sheet for all years 2008-2012 in the 2014 report. In the 2013 report these two variables were included in the EFFORT_FAO_LEVEL3_4 sheet, but both were moved to the new EFFORT_GEAR sheet in the templates for 2014. That may be due to some misunderstanding, because in the 2015 report the variables â€tototKwFishDaysâ€ and â€tototGTFishDaysâ€ are included in three sheets EFFORT_TOT, EFFORT_FS_SUPRA and EFFORT_GEAR.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
488	JRC	2014	Processing		The â€turnover attributed to fish processingâ€ for enterprises carrying out fish processing not as a main activity is reported as zero for all years. As explained by the national expert, the actual value is not zero (and indeed it could not be, as the value provided for â€number of enterprises carrying cannot fish processing not as a main activityâ€ is not zero) but it cannot be shown for confidentiality reasons.	LOW	COVERAGE	For enterprises carrying out fish processing, but not as a main activity, it is mandatory to collect the following data, in the first year of each period: a) Number of enterprise and b) Turnover attributed to fish processing. Denmark has fulfilled this obligation and has collected both the number of enterprises and the turnover attributed to the fish processing for these enterprises. However, as already stated in the question and discussed several times with the JRC, the turnover cannot be shown do to confidentiality reasons. The reason is that one enterprise constitutes more than 80% of the total turnover from this group of enterprises, and from the general rules of securing confidentiality the sum for all enterprises carrying out fish processing not as a main activity cannot be shown. The problem is situated within the data collection system of JRC. The National experts have to choose between entering a â€missing valueâ€ or a â€zeroâ€, when reporting. However, as the number is neither â€missingâ€ nor â€zeroâ€, but is confidential, â€zeroâ€ is preferred to â€missingâ€. JRC should establish a new category allowing National expert to report numbers as confidential.	Reasonable justification was provided by MS. The issue raised by end user is not relevant as confidentiality rules applied by MS	Satisfactory
18	ICCAT	2014	[ None ]	T1FC: Fleet Characteristics	no data for TRAW fleet (ICCAT species only as by-catch)	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	Denmark is not having any fisheries on the stocks dealt with by ICCAT.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
19	ICCAT	2014	[ None ]	T1NC: Nominal Catches	no data on sharks by-catch (TRAW fleet)	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	Denmark is not having any fisheries on the stocks dealt with by ICCAT.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
20	ICCAT	2014	[ None ]	T2CE: Catch and Effort	no data on TRAW fleet (mostly sharks as by-catch)	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	Denmark is not having any fisheries on the stocks dealt with by ICCAT.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
21	RCM	2014	[ None ]	NS&EA:age and legth data	the number of species in age and length samples in the RDB differed between before and after the extraction of sample records with no information from the RDB	UNKNOWN	QUALITY	This is not a MS problem but a problem in the way ICES extected the data from the RDB. Denmark has uploaded all the data to the RDB correctly.	Issue raised by the RCM NS&EA is unclear. It seems that problem rather lies in the RDB than on MS' side. In order to solve such detailed problems, a direct communication between RDB technical management and MS would be more appropriate.	Unknown
22	RCM	2014	[ None ]	NA: size data	no length and single fish weight and length measuremnts on eel (Anguilla anguilla) in reference year 2013	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	Denmark has 2 separete database system were the eel data due the method used for data collection has been allocated in an other data base than the rest of the commercial species. This has been streamlined in 2014 and it is now possible to get the eil data and the same format as the rest of the species. Length data are available from eels back to 2004.	MS reply is acceptable. This issue is not relevant for MS	Satisfactory
23	RCM	2014	[ None ]	Baltic: age data	no data on single fish age for eel (Anguilla anguilla) in reference years 2011-2013	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	It is presently not possible to age determine eels and Denmark has therefore not delivered any age data on eils.	MS to clarify why it is not possible to age eel.	Unsatisfactory
24	RCM	2014	[ None ]	Baltic: age data	no data on single fish age for salmon (Salmo salar) in reference year 2010	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	Salmon have been uplaoded together with the other species. Therefore, the issue do not concern Denmark.	Issue to be investigated by DGMARE (MS states that data was submitted as requested, this can not be verified by EWG)	Unknown
25	RCM	2014	[ None ]	Baltic: sex and maturity	no data on sex and maturity of fished species in 2014	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	The data call only include commercial data and did not include research vessel survey data. Sex and maturity data is obtained from surveys and according to the Danish NP:	MS answer is acceptable	Satisfactory
346	JRC	2014	Effort		No effort or catch information for the special conditions BACOMA or T90 in the Baltic.	LOW	UNKNOWN	Recording of the use of BACOMA or T90 in the Baltic is not compulsory to record in Danish logbooks. The Danish AgriFish Agency (the national authority) has every year in an official letter informed the JRC/STECF on this issue. The Commission has approved the Danish management of the fisheries in the Baltic Sea.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1094	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: HAWG. EcoRegion: North Sea	her-3a22: Estimation of stock identity of herring from the transfer area in Division IVa East should be improved.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Very low Danish landings from this area leads to limited information on stock ID of herring in the area. Survey data are at present only available from the Danish acoustic survey, this could be improved if Norwegian data were made available.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory

## DENMARK

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1102	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: HAWG. EcoRegion: North Sea	her-47d3: ICES is concerned about the lack of information on unallocated removals in all herring fisheries; efforts should be made to maintain observer coverage across fleets that catch a substantial proportion of pelagic fish and to report on these issues. Introduction of the EU landing obligation may change this situation.	MEDIUM	COVERAGE	Estimation of slippage from observations is considered biased without a 100% observer coverage, not applied for the Danish sampling for this species. According to the NP.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1109	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	her-noss: While discarding in the fisheries of this stock is considered to be low, slippage occurs. The amount of slippage is unquantified and thus cannot be accounted for in the assessment.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Estimation of slippage from observations is considered biased without a 100% observer coverage, not applied for the Danish sampling for this species. In accordance with the NP.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1122	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	hke-nrth: Assessment data arrived after the ICES data call deadline, thus reducing time to review and audit the assessment results. Although the data were used, the delay may reduce ICES quality assurance.	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Deadline was 10/4 and data were submitted 10/4 to InterCatch according to 'Creation date' in InterCatch.	MS Reply is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1131	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	hke-nrth: Only partial discards are included in the assessment and forecast. In order to reduce uncertainty in discard estimates, an increased sampling level for on-board observer programmes is needed for some fleets (non-Nephrops trawlers, gillnetters, and longliners).	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Observer program in Denmark is covering the trawlers (also non-nephrops trawlers) and gillnetters are covered by a self-sampling program. Longliner is not covered do to judgment of a relatively low discard level	MS Reply is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1140	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	hke-nrth: There is large uncertainty associated with the estimation of discards. Hake otoliths are currently collected but not used in the assessment due to lack of a validated ageing method. The utility of the current sampling and its level should be re-evaluated.	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN	Denmark is still collecting hake otoliths although there presently is now evaluated method for the age reading. If a age reading method is found the historic ages can be read.	MS Reply is acceptable.Ã	Satisfactory
1154	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	hom-nsea: When considering the potential mixing of Western and North Sea horse mackerel in Division VIIId, better information on the biological origin of catches from that area would greatly improve the quality of future scientific advice and, consequently, management of the North Sea horse mackerel stock.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This will require additional information (e.g. genetic analysis) which is not included in the standard data collection.	MS Reply is acceptable.Ã	Satisfactory
1163	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	hom-west: As in previous years, and despite the data sampling regulations for EU countries, some countries with major catches have not conducted biological sampling programmes.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	More than 99% of the Danish landings of horsemackerel are landed outside Denmark. In addition the DanishÃ landings are less than 4% of the total international landings for thisÃ species.	MS Reply is acceptable.Ã	Satisfactory
1172	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	hom-west: Not all countries provide data on discards; consequently, there is no estimate of the total amount of discards in the horse mackerel fisheries.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	As given in the Danish NP no discard samling was planned to be carried out for this fishery.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1197	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	mac-nea: Limited sampling for discards has been carried out since 2000, despite a formal requirement initiated in the EU in 2002. Estimating the discarded and slipped proportions of catch is problematic in pelagic fisheries due to high variability in discard and slipping practices. In some fleets no sampling for discards is carried out, including those fleets for which discarding is illegal. The discards included in the catch in the assessment are an underestimate.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Denmark had a relatively high sampling level of landings with 97% coverage of its fisheries. EstimationÃ of slippage from observations is considered biased without a 100% observer coverage, not applied for the Danish sampling for this species.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1281	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	ple-2123: No historical discard information prior to 2011 is available, but discards are considered to be significant.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Denmark has a statistically sound discard sampling program for all ground fish species in the Baltic including the plaice. The stock was benchmarked in 2015 where all historic discard data were delivered from Denmark.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1287	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	ple-2432: Information on discards is limited and indicates that discarding is substantial, but the data are insufficient to estimate a discard proportion that could be applied to give catch advice.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Denmark has a statistically sound discard sampling program for all ground fish species in the Baltic including plaice. The stock was benchmarked in 2015 where all historic discard data were delivered from Denmark back to 2002.	MS Reply is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1392	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	tur-2232: Catch data, including discards, need to be improved to get a better understanding of the state of turbot in the Baltic Sea. Biological data would be required to distinguish stock components.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Denmark has a statistically sound sampling program for all ground fish species in the Baltic including the turbot. The stock was benchmarked in 2014 where historic discard data were delivered from Denmark back to 2002.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory

DENMARK										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1435	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: North Sea	bil-2232a: 2013 landing, discard and biological sampling data not submitted in time to WGBFAS data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Deadline was 20/3 and Danish data were submitted 21/3 and 22/3 to InterCatch according to 'Creation date' in InterCatch. By mistake the date for the deadline was misscheduled. This did not have a negative impact on the assessment work.	Denmark should ensure that all requested data are submitted on time	Unsatisfactory
1451	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	boc-nea: boarfish is not currently included under the EU Data Collection Framework. A comprehensive and coordinated sampling scheme and a continuation of the targeted acoustic survey are needed to provide the scientific basis for advice on this species.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Denmark is sampling this stock and has provided all requested data timely. Even data on age structure despite these data are not used in the assessment	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1504	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	cod-2532: Ageing discrepancies between countries have been recognised for a long time but the recent trend in growth rate may have increased the consequence of this problem.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Age estimation is a major concern for this stock and projects have been initiated to find a solution. However, presently there is no reliable way to age determine the cod 2532. Denmark has participated in all initiatives to solve this issue.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1512	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	cod-2532: Removals of cod in recreational fisheries in the Baltic Sea are currently neither consistently nor completely sampled.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Denmark has a sampling program for the recreational fishery and it is estimated to be minor in cod2532. The recreational data is not requested by the working group for this stock. Danish data is available.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1024	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	cod-347d: The Danish REX, UK northeast coast, and UK whitefish surveys have all been discontinued due to lack of funding. Such surveys require sustained support for at least five years in order for their outputs to be considered for inclusion in stock assessments as time-series indices.	MEDIUM	QUALITY	The Danish REX surveys which are not and have never been a part of the DCF are not used in present cod assessment. Very long data time series are necessary to implement this type of local scale surveys according to habitat/seabed type and will take considerable resources to implement. And this will again demand extensive expansion of the survey area so far covered in REX.	MS reply is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1032	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	cod-347d: Unaccounted removals are no longer estimated for 2006 onwards. The main sources of uncertainty are aspects of the input data (historical landings and discards; discrepancies between stock trends implied by the age structure of the commercial catch and surveys) and the assumption of fishing mortality and recruitment in the advice forecast. SSB has been overestimated in previous years.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	The quality of international catch data (both landings and discards) is estimatedÅ to have improved after 2006 (largely as a fact of changes in UK buyers and sellers regulation, but also in Denmark for a variety of reasons, cf WKCOD 2011). Therefore, for the period 2006 and onwards catch data are considered reliable enough to be used as such in a standard way, without the need to estimate a parameter of unaccounted mortality. This parameter is now only estimated for the period where data are known to be unreliable (1998-2005). As this parameter is no longer estimated for the recent period is a positive sign.	MS answer is acceptable. Such very general statement from the WG is very difficult to comment on in relation to a specific country. Agreed coordinated actions must be implemented through future data calls. This type of issue has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1047	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	dab-nsea: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	Deadline was 28/3 and Danish data were submitted 28/3 to InterCatch according to 'Creation date' in InterCatch.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1056	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	fle-nsea: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	Deadline was 28/3 and Danish data were submitted 28/3 to InterCatch according to 'Creation date' in InterCatch.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1063	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	fle-nsea: Landings data are not complete before 1998, and are probably not indicative of catches. Discards should be estimated and added to the landings.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Denmark has submitting all discard estimates that have been requested. We have a statistical sound discard sampling program covering the North Sea and flounder caught in this program have been delivered if data was requested.	MS answer is acceptable. Such very general statement from the WG is very difficult to comment on in relation to a specific country. Agreed coordinated actions must be implemented through future data calls. This type of issue has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1068	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	fle-nsea: The mixed TAC with dab reduces the accuracy of catch statistics per species. International sampling effort for this species is at a very low level as only the Netherlands is collecting data. An increase in sampling intensity should be considered.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	The official Danish landing statistics provided to ICES is given by species even though the mixed TAC for dab and flounder. In 2013 Denmark only caught 26% of the national quota (after quota swapping). These landings are far below the threshold given in the DCF.	MS answer is acceptable. Such very general statement from the WG is very difficult to comment on in relation to a specific country. Agreed coordinated actions must be implemented through future data calls. This type of issue has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1074	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	gug-347d: Species misidentification continues to be a major problem in estimating the landings of all gurnards and hence grey gurnard. In addition, discarding is estimated to be high	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Misidentification is not considered to be a problem in the Danish landings statistics and for sure not on the scientific vessels. Discard estimates are available but have not requested.	MS answer is acceptable. Such very general statement from the WG is very difficult to comment on in relation to a specific country. Agreed coordinated actions must be implemented through future data calls. This type of issue has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1080	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	had-34/had-346a: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	Deadline was 28/3 and Danish data were submitted 28/3 to InterCatch according to 'Creation date' in InterCatch.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1174	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	lem-nsea: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Deadline was 28/3 and Danish data were submitted 28/3 to InterCatch according to 'Creation date' in InterCatch.	MS Reply is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1177	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	alf-comb: 2013 landings, discard and biological sampling data not submitted in time to WGDEEP data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	No Danish (present or historical) landings or discard of this stock.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory

## DENMARK

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1184	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	lin-oth: 2013 landings, discard and biological sampling data not submitted in time to WGDEEP data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Deadline 28/3 and Danish data were submitted 31/3 to InterCatch according to 'Creation date' in InterCatch.	Denmark should ensure that all requested data is submitted on time in response to data calls	Satisfactory
1205	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCSE. EcoRegion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland	ang-ivi: 2013 landings, discard and biological sampling data on discard and landings not submitted in time to WGCSE data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Deadline was 17/4. Danish data were first submitted 30/4 to InterCatch according to 'Creation date' in InterCatch. By a mistake the otoliths were not read before the deadline and a postponed deadline was agreed and granted by the stock coordinator.	Denmark should ensure that all requested data is submitted on time in response to data calls	Satisfactory
1220	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGMIXFISH-ADVCE. EcoRegion: North Sea	mix-fish: Mixed-fisheries analysis and projections critically rely on data being available on time to allow sufficient quality checking and preparation. Some data were submitted only shortly before the meeting, which limited the possibilities for additional data investigations.	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Mixed-fisheries analysis and projections critically rely on data being available on time to allow sufficient quality checking and preparation. Some data were submitted only shortly before the meeting, which limited the possibilities for additional data investigations. A Danish data delivered on time. The issue concerns data from other MS	MS reply is acceptable. ICES should identify which MSs this comment is directed at, to avoid all MS having to answer.	Satisfactory
1225	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	mur-347d: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	Deadline was 28/3 and data should have been submitted 28/3 together with the other species. The data have been updated in InterCatch in October due to the benchmark, so the 'Creation data' do not reflect the submission to the WGNSSK data call.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1237	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	nep-10-Nov (FU10), The time-series of UWTV survey data is incomplete and no survey has been conducted since 2007. There are no reliable effort data for this FU and therefore no resulting lpue.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This comment is not relevant to Denmark. The Danish UWTV is carried out in Division IIIa.	MS answer is acceptable. However, this is a general comment which should not have been sent out to all MS.	Satisfactory
1242	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	nep-3-4: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	Danish data were submitted later than the deadline due to a requested revision of the method for calculating discard. This was done in full agreement with the stock coordinator. In addition Denmark had some problem uploading the file due to InterCatch problems.	MS Reply is acceptable, but every effort should be made to provide data on time	Satisfactory
1247	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	nep-32: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	Danish data were submitted later than the deadline due to a requested revision of the method for calculating discard. This was done in full agreement with the stock coordinator. In addition Denmark had some problem uploading the file due to InterCatch problems.	MS Reply is acceptable, but every effort should be made to provide data on time	Satisfactory
1256	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	nep-33: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	Danish data were submitted later than the deadline due to a requested revision of the method for calculating discard. This was done in full agreement with the stock coordinator. In addition Denmark had some problem uploading the file due to InterCatch problems.	MS reply is acceptable, but every effort should be made to provide data on time.	Satisfactory
1308	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	ple-nsea: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	Deadline was 28/3 and Danish data was submitted 28/3 together with the other species. The data have been updated in InterCatch in October due the benchmark, so the 'Creation data' do not reflect the submission to the WGNSSK data call.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1314	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	ple-skag: Data for discards are only available since 2012, hence the catch advice is based on the average of the last 2 years of catches.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Discard was previously not requested and included in the assessment for the Skagerrak. Discards data time series since 2002 done and made available for the benchmark 2015 and available to WGNSSK 2015	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1324	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	pol-nsea: ICES now considers that discards are known to take place, but can only be quantified for part of the landings.	MEDIUM	QUALITY	Discard information from pollack is sampled in the North Sea and Skagerrak at the same level as all other ground fish stocks. However data has presently not been requested for this stock but Danish data is availbale.	ICES comment is too general. MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1335	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	rng-kask: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGDEEP data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	Danish landings < 1 t landings of this stock. Deadline 28/3 and data were submitted 31/3 to InterCatch according to 'Creation date' in InterCatch.	Denmark should ensure that all requested data is submitted on time in response to data calls	Satisfactory
1343	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	rng-rest: 2013 landings and discard not submitted in time to WGDEEP data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	No Danish landings of this stock. Danish discard were submitted 31/3 to InterCatch according to 'Creation date' in InterCatch.	Denmark should ensure that all requested data is submitted on time in response to data calls	Satisfactory
1350	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	sai-3a46: 2013 landings, discard and biological sampling data of landings and discard not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	Deadline was 28/3 and Danish data were submitted 28/3 to InterCatch according to 'Creation date' in InterCatch.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1352	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	arg-oth: 2013 landings and discard not submitted in time to WGDEEP data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Deadline 28/3 and Danish data were submitted 31/3 to InterCatch according to 'Creation date' in InterCatch.	Denmark should ensure that all requested data is submitted on time in response to data calls	Satisfactory
1397	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	tur-nsea: 2013 landing, discard and biol. Sampling data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	Deadline was 28/3 and Danish data have been submitted 28/3 together with the other species. The data have been updated in IC in October, so the 'Creation data' do not reflect the submission to the WGNSSK data call.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory



## DENMARK

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1401	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	tur-nsea: The collection of data needs to be continued in order to get a better understanding of the state of turbot stocks in the Northeast Atlantic. Priority should be given to improvement of catch-at-age information available from different countries and fleets. A fisheries independent index of abundance covering the whole stock area would improve the assessment of this stock.	HIGH	QUALITY	Existing North Sea flatfish surveys and IBTS data should be investigated to analyse whether a robust survey index can be obtained from existing surveys by integrating information covering different areas.Â Commercial surveys can be considered as well potentially in combination with coverage of brill. Relevant Danish data has been made available. Danish survey data has been uploaded to the DATRAS timely.	ICES comment is too general. MS answer is acceptable.This type of issue has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1414	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	whg-47d: 2013 landings, discard and biol. Sampling data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	Deadline was 28/3 and Danish data were submitted 28/3 to InterCatch according to 'Creation date' in InterCatch.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1422	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	whg-kask: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	Deadline was 28/3 and Danish data were submitted 28/3 to InterCatch according to 'Creation date' in InterCatch.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1427	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	bli-oth: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGDEEP data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Deadline 28/3 andDanishÂ data were submitted 31/3 to InterCatch according to 'Creation date' in InterCatch.	Denmark should ensure that all requested data is submitted on time in response to data calls	Satisfactory
1429	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	wit-nsea: 2013 landings, discard and biological sampling data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	Deadline was 28/3 and Danish data have been submitted 28/3 together with the other species. The data have been updated in IC in October, so the 'Creation data' do not reflect the submission to the WGNSSK data call.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1437	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	bll-nsea: 2013 landing, discard and biological sampling data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	Deadline was 28/3 and Danish data were submitted 28/3 to InterCatch according to 'Creation date' in InterCatch.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1447	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	bll-nsea: Fishery-independent surveys catch very few large brill, creating data gaps for the greater fish lengths. Commercial surveys could be developed to effectively monitor the full age and size spectrum of this species.	MEDIUM	QUALITY	International agreements should be made on this matter. Such an survey could be designed to cover several species, e.g. also turbot. No data end-user has yet asked for this type of data. It seems to be a "nice to have" and not a "need to have".	MS answer is acceptable. ICES comment is too general and should not be adressed as an data transmission failure. This type of issues has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1477	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCEPH. EcoRegion: NA	Cephalopods: data not delivered in time: survey data 2013 England and Wales, Discard data Wales, ALL data from France	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Dealine were before 3/6 and Danish data were sent to ICES 3/6 according to mail from ICES recognising the submission.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1491	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCEPH. EcoRegion: NA	Cephalopods: There is still a data clarification request process to be deployed in relation to: a) Species (even family level) identification in the catches and landings (northern countries and France) b) Discards: more biological data related to cephalopods (already being collected by some countries). c) Discard data: sampled level for discard for submission. All data should be raised.	MEDIUM	QUALITY	Is this a question ?? Do not uderstand what we as MS should do to this.	MS reply is acceptable. This comment is too generic and does not specify which MSs are required to take what action. ICES should identify which MSs this comment is directed at, to avoid all MS having to answer.	Satisfactory
1514	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	cod-347d: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	Deadline was 28/3 and Danish data have been submitted 28/3 together with the other species. The data have been updated in IC in October, so the 'Creation data' do not reflect the submission to the WGNSSK data call.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory

## ESTONIA

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
403	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Only capacity data submitted for the fleet segment DTS VL40XX (confidentiality issues). Impact: Incomplete national, EU and regional coverage	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Due to confidentiality issues, only capacity data for the fleet segment DTS VL40XX were submitted. There were only two companies operating with 5 vessels in this segment.	According to the end user comment there is a clear confidentiality problem. The issue is not relevant for the data submission failure and MS comment is justified.	Satisfactory
404	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Significant amount of data missing for the coastal fleet (PG VL0010 and PG VL1012). Impact: Incomplete times series, national fleet and EU overview; due to confidentiality issues	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Effort data missing for the coastal fleet (PG VL0010 and PG VL1012). Effort data (days at sea, fishing days) are based on the data obtained from the Estonian Fisheries Information System (EFIS). So far, effort data for the coastal fleet (under 12m) were not available from the EFIS. According to the latest information, the system is improved and the data are available from this year.	End user is not clear enough specifying the problem. According to the MS response only effort data is missing. It is not possible to do assessment of the issue raised.	Unknown
405	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Employment (FTE) data not submitted for 2008 and 2009. Impact: Incomplete times series, national and EU overview not possible to calculate some socio-economic indicators	HIGH	UNKNOWN	The data based on questionnaires. The data obtained for 2008 and 2009 were not sufficient to calculate the FTE values. The survey will be repeated to obtain the data for 2008 and 2009.	MS reply is reasonable. The issue raised is repetitive and refers to historical data.	Satisfactory
406	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Capital value not submitted for the inactive VL40XX segment. Impact: Incomplete economic, time-series and national fleet analysis	HIGH	UNKNOWN	The data were not submitted due to confidentiality issues.	MS justification is reasonable.	Satisfactory
407	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Inconsistent use of clustering over the time period. Impact: Incomplete/inaccurate times series analyses	HIGH	COVERAGE	In previous years (2008,2009), there were a few vessels (2-3) in the Baltic Sea fleet which were clustered based on sampling purposes, as well as for confidentiality reasons. These vessels are not in the fleet anymore.	MS justification is reasonable.	Satisfactory
489	JRC	2014	Processing		Data on subsidies reported as zero	LOW	COVERAGE	According to the definition, subsidies should include direct payments, e.g. compensation for stopping trading, refunds of fuel duties or similar lump sum compensation payments; and exclude social benefit payments and indirect subsidies e.g. reduced duty on inputs such as fuel or investment subsidies. Subsidies in Estonia consist of investment subsidies and social benefit payments.	MS sufficiently explained reported zero values, consequently it could be justified. In Commission Decision (2010/93/EU) is stated that subsidies for fish processing income includes direct payments, whereas social benefit payments and indirect subsidies are excluded. This type of issues should not be raised as failures in the compliance exercise by end user.	Satisfactory
26	RCM	2014	[ None ]	NS&EA: comercial landings, effort and sampling	missing data on commercial samplings for RY 2009-2013	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	RCM NS&EA includes NAFO area. The commercial sampling data was uploaded including the discard sampling. Barents Sea sampling is not in Estonian national data collection program.	Issue to be investigated by DGMARE. The end user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies	Unknown
27	RCM	2014	[ None ]	NA: size data	no length and single fish weight and length measuremnts on eel (Anguilla anguilla) in reference years 2009-2010	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	There was zero catch of eel in relevant area.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
28	RCM	2014	[ None ]	Baltic: age data	no data on single fish age for eel (Anguilla anguilla) in reference years 20009-2013	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	Eel catches in the Estonian coastal waters have declined almost to zero, and only a few specimens could be analysed annually in recent years. Our intention is to send collected material for experienced age reader outside when appropriate number of fish (ca 100) is collected.	MS reply is acceptable.	Satisfactory
29	RCM	2014	[ None ]	Baltic: age data	no data on single fish age for salmon (Salmo salar) in reference years 2009-2010	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	Biological data for salmon (SAL) is not presented due to inapropriate data format. Salmon data has been presented to all the relevant working groups in ICES.	Estonia to clarify what the issue with the RCM data call format is. It is important that all relevant data are transmitted. Issue to be investigated by DGMARE (MS states that data was submitted as requested, this can not be verified by EWG)	Unknown
30	RCM	2014	[ None ]	Baltic: sex and maturity	no data on maturity of fished species in 2013	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	Maturity is optional field in RCM FF datacall. This is the reason for not uploading the data for all species. However the maturity data has been uploaded for internationally assessed species, sprat and herring but the data has been erased from database. Estonia has uploaded already 2014 maturity data for sprat and herring but looking at the database now, the data is missing.	Issue to be investigated by DGMARE (MS states that data was submitted as requested, this can not be verified by EWG)	Unknown
31	RCM	2014	[ None ]	Baltic: age and length data	no data on age and length of discard species for RY 2009-2013	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	Discarding is not allowed in the Estonian waters.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
347	JRC	2014	Effort		Table A, catch: No discards information for 2013 data, discards provided for flounder only in 2012 data (landings of cod over three times greater than flounder in 2012).	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Discards are not allowed by law in Estonian waters. For long distance fishery the discard information is collected by on-board observers who are deployed in areas that are in Estonian National Data Collection Program (NDCP). The program includes NAFO areas that are not relevant to Effort data call. As catches in NEAFC area have increased in recent years, Estonia is considering options to change theÅ NDPC to cover the NEAFC area. Other source of discard information are vessel discard reports (DIS) submitted through vessel Electronic Reporting System (ERS) by vessels. However DIS reports for 2013 have been submitted only for NAFO area and not for NEAFC area. Available discard information has been submitted in RCM FF datacall that includes also NAFO area and to NAFO SC in Annual National Research Report.	MS reply is acceptable. Significant increases in landings in the NEAFC should ideally be monitored, and the ability to revise National Programmes in October 2015 is an opportunity to include such sampling in the Estonian DCF National Programme proposal.	Satisfactory
348	JRC	2014	Effort		Table A, catch: Some mesh size ranges for GILL, PELAGIC_TRAWL and POTS inconsistent with the data call.	HIGH	COVERAGE	For PELAGIC_TRAWL used mesh_size_ranges were <16, 16-31, 55-69 and >=105 that correspond to the data call coding. From this year (2015) some changes have been made in logbooks and fishermen have been trained how to enter the data. Hopefully the data will be available from 2015. Fishermen were not obliged to record the meshsize in costal fisheries for some time. The mesh sized used in small vessel groups is aproximation made using educated guess.	MS reply is acceptable, on the understanding that mesh size data will now be available and submitted for the relevant data calls as indicated by the MS.	Satisfactory

## ESTONIA

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1053	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	fle-2732: Previous results (ICES, 2014c) indicate that landings in the recreational fishery are large enough to influence the flounder populations in this assessment unit. However, better estimates from the recreational fishery are needed, with respective estimates of uncertainty.	MEDIUM	QUALITY	Recreational catch of flounder was 26 % of the total catch in Estonian waters of the SD 32, 16 % in SD 29, and 9 % in SD 28 in 2014. Most part of the recreational fishers use gillnets. Gillnets are very selective and gillnet data are useful for tuningÂ of the analytical assessment model (for example VPA), but they can be used for holistic models as well. For estimating abundance of different age groups less selective gears (for example traps, which are used usually for commercial fishery) are needed. Total catch is important number in the VPA model and recreational catch must be included into it.Â Â	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1196	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	mac-nea: Limited sampling for discards has been carried out since 2000, despite a formal requirement initiated in the EU in 2002. Estimating the discarded and slipped proportions of catch is problematic in pelagic fisheries due to high variability in discard and slipping practices. In some fleets no sampling for discards is carried out, including those fleets for which discarding is illegal. The discards included in the catch in the assessment are an underestimate.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Estonia submitted data to the WGWIDE as, "There was only one vessel fishing. The gear used was a pelagic trawl and the catch was processed by freezing. The catch was taken in 3rd quarter as follows:". There were Estonian and Greenlandic observer onboard. Estonian observer reported zero discards. Greenlandic observer report is not available to Estonia.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1282	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	ple-2432: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGBFAS data call submission deadline or before workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Estonian Ministry of Agriculture as well as Ministry of Environment have not reported catches of plaice by Estonian fishers from SD 24-32. Therefore all Intercatch files from 2002 to 2014 are filled by 0 catches and uploaded to Intercatch database.	MS response is acceptable	Satisfactory
1391	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	tur-2232: Catch data, including discards, need to be improved to get a better understanding of the state of turbot in the Baltic Sea. Biological data would be required to distinguish stock components.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Estonian turbot catches form SD 24-32 are currently very small.Â 0.1 t by commercial fishery and 0.1 t by recreational fishery as bycatch were reported in 2014 from SD 29 and 32. Single individuals can be found during BITS experimental trawlings and sampling from commercial fishery. BITS (DATRAS) trawling allow to estimate turbot's stock density from the year 2000. In order to improve studies on turbot's biology additional data are needed to collect.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1406	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: NA. EcoRegion: NA	VMS data call with Helcom (Dec 2013): Estonia - Missing the gear type	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	There are two different information systems (databases) in Estonia, ERS and VMS, that are managed by different institutions. It was not possible to compile two databases to include fishing gear, species nor landings. Extractions from logbooks containing this information will be uploaded on first possible moment. This has been communicated with ICES as well. Concerning the Expert Group North Atlantic, Estonia is not fishing in relevant areas. Concerning the activities in NS&EA, all gear was OTB.	MS response is acceptable this year, however it is important for Estonia to ensure that details of gear type are available for future data calls	Satisfactory
1492	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	cod-2224: 2009 data not submitted in time to WKBALCOD data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Uploading took place late due to technical problems in uploading to the database.Â	MS Reply is acceptable due to technical problems, which we assume have been resolved for future data submissions. Estonia should ensure that all requested data are submitted on time for data calls.	Satisfactory
1494	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	cod-2532: 2009 data not submitted in time to WKBALCOD data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Uploading took place late due to technical problems in uploading to the database.Â	MS Reply is acceptable due to technical problems, which we assume have been resolved for future data submissions. Estonia should ensure that all requested data are submitted on time for data calls.	Satisfactory
1503	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	cod-2532: Ageing discrepancies between countries have been recognised for a long time but the recent trend in growth rate may have increased the consequence of this problem.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Age-based Intercatch files were replaced by length-based Intercatch files.	MS reply is acceptable. At the moment there is no reliable way to assign age for Cod 25-32	Satisfactory
1511	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	cod-2532: Removals of cod in recreational fisheries in the Baltic Sea are currently neither consistently nor completely sampled.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	There is no cod sampling from Estonian recreational fishery due to very low numbers of cod in Estonian waters.	MS response is acceptable	Satisfactory
1334	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	rng-5b67: The current assessment method does not use catches from Division XIIb. Exploratory assessments were carried out using these data but are not yet considered to be reliable for advice. Fishing activity in Division XIIb currently may contribute to around 30% of the catch. The actual level of catch has been considered uncertain for several years because of problems with species reporting and misreporting to/from other areas. As this issue strongly impacts the quality of the assessment, it is necessary that substantial efforts are made to increase the monitoring of the fishery operating in Division XIIb. Countries fishing in XIIb should report reliable landings data. Countries not fishing should report 0 landings and/or 0 effort.	HIGH	QUALITY	Estonia has no catches or reported discards of relevant species in relevant areas concerning the ICES WGDEEP data call. Estonia reported 0 landings and 0 effort.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory

FINLAND										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
408	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Missing data (FTE, income from landings, energy costs, etc. for 2012) for the fleet segment DFN VL1218, unable to estimate economic indicators. Impact: Incomplete times series, national and EU overview	HIGH	UNKNOWN	From 2012 on, Finland is not reporting DFN VL1218 as a separate vessel segment with the economic data as there are too few observations (less than 3) to make any analysis. Thus the segment is clustered with PG VL1012 from 2012 on.	MS reply is reasonable. However it seems that clustering had not been reported correctly in 2012.	Satisfactory
490	JRC	2014	Processing		The MS committed to collect data by segment according to the national program but did not provide it	LOW	UNKNOWN	In the Commission decision (2010/93/EU) in the Appendix XII the list of economic variables for the processing industry sector are presented and the number of enterprises by size category is one variable to be collected. However, the Commission decision does not state any segmentation for processing to be applied when collecting the data. Thus segment in the Finnish National Programme refers to national segmentation (enterprise size class by turnover) and it does not refer to a segment of size category by number of persons employed. In any case, Finland is able to provide the economic data by size category from 2012 on, if requested.	MS provided relatively sufficient justification. In table IVB1 of NP, collection of economic variables is provided by segments which are the size category based on number of employment. According to the AR the data is collected on the census level and might be available on the voluntary basis. MS is encouraged to provide the data by segment if possible.	Satisfactory
32	RCM	2014	[ None ]	Baltic: age data	no data on single fish age for salmon (Salmo salar) in reference years 2009-2013	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	The RDB (FishFrame) has data on 4855 salmon individuals in reference years 2009-2013. The age data for salmon exist in Finnish national database, but due to a minor bug, ages were not included in RDB (FishFrame) CS files (2009 - 2013). The bug will be fixed and data re-uploaded to RDB.	MS should clarify when data will be available, the missing data should be uploaded as soon as possible, if it hasn't already been done.	Unsatisfactory
349	JRC	2014	Effort		Because in previous years data was supplied in format inconsistent with the definitions of the data call (on the grounds of the data confidentiality clause in the DCF) the following data is missing from the dataset: Table A Catch: 2003-2012 data for vessels > 10m length.	HIGH	UNKNOWN	The Finnish fishing fleet is very small in size. The low number of the vessels in several metiers means that we have not been able to split the data according to all given classifiers. Instead, we have submitted the information in a higher aggregation level, i.e. we combined quarters, vessel length groups, subdivisions and/or mesh sizes . Otherwise, the data would in many cases refer to a single vessel. The Council Regulation EC 199/2008, Article 20 (4), says that a Member State may refuse to transmit the relevant data if there is a risk of natural persons and/or legal entities of being identified. MS reply is acceptable. Further, the same Article states that a Member State has the right to propose alternative means, which ensure anonymity, to meet the needs of the end-users. For some years we have tried to open discussion with JRC on how to transmit the data in such a way that data would fulfill JRC needs, but not allow identification of natural persons or legal entities. We are in the opinion that in this particular case our procedure is in accordance with the Council Regulation EC 199/2008.		Satisfactory
350	JRC	2014	Effort		Table B Effort: 2003-2012 data for vessels > 10m length.	HIGH	UNKNOWN	The Finnish fishing fleet is very small in size. The low number of the vessels in several metiers means that we have not been able to split the data according to all given classifiers. Instead, we have submitted the information in a higher aggregation level, i.e. we combined quarters, vessel length groups, subdivisions and/or mesh sizes . Otherwise, the data would in many cases refer to a single vessel. The Council Regulation EC 199/2008, Article 20 (4), says that a Member State may refuse to transmit the relevant data if there is a risk of natural persons and/or legal entities of being identified. Further, the same Article states that a Member State has the right to propose alternative means, which ensure anonymity, to meet the needs of the end-users. For some years we have tried to open discussion with JRC on how to transmit the data in such a way that data would fulfill JRC needs, but not allow identification of natural persons or legal entities. We are in the opinion that in this particular case our procedure is in accordance with the Council Regulation EC 199/2008.	The MS reply seems to be acceptable. However, the end-user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies.	Unknown
351	JRC	2014	Effort		Table C Effort by rectangle: all data 2003-2012.	HIGH	UNKNOWN	The Finnish fishing fleet is very small in size. The low number of the vessels in several metiers means that we have not been able to split the data according to all given classifiers. Instead, we have submitted the information in a higher aggregation level, i.e. we combined quarters, vessel length groups, subdivisions and/or mesh sizes . Otherwise, the data would in many cases refer to a single vessel. The Council Regulation EC 199/2008, Article 20 (4), says that a Member State may refuse to transmit the relevant data if there is a risk of natural persons and/or legal entities of being identified. Further, the same Article states that a Member State has the right to propose alternative means, which ensure anonymity, to meet the needs of the end-users. For some years we have tried to open discussion with JRC on how to transmit the data in such a way that data would fulfill JRC needs, but not allow identification of natural persons or legal entities. We are in the opinion that in this particular case our procedure is in accordance with the Council Regulation EC 199/2008.	The MS reply seems to be acceptable. However, the end-user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies.	Unknown



FINLAND										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
352	JRC	2014	Effort		Table D capacity: 2003-2011 fishing activity days.	HIGH	UNKNOWN	The Finnish fishing fleet is very small in size. The low number of the vessels in several metiers means that we have not been able to split the data according to all given classifiers. Instead, we have submitted the information in a higher aggregation level, i.e. we combined quarters, vessel length groups, subdivisions and/or mesh sizes . Otherwise, the data would in many cases refer to a single vessel. The Council Regulation EC 199/2008, Article 20 (4), says that a Member State may refuse to transmit the relevant data if there is a risk of natural persons and/or legal entities of being identified. Further, the same Article states that a Member State has the right to propose alternative means, which ensure anonymity, to meet the needs of the end-users. For some years we have tried to open discussion with JRC on how to transmit the data in such a way that data would fulfill JRC needs, but not allow identification of natural persons or legal entities. We are in the opinion that in this particular case our procedure is in accordance with the Council Regulation EC 199/2008.	The MS reply seems to be acceptable. However, the end-user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies.	Unknown
353	JRC	2014	Effort		Table E Landings by rectangle: 2003-2011 all data, 2012 data for vessels > 10m length.	HIGH	UNKNOWN	The Finnish fishing fleet is very small in size. The low number of the vessels in several metiers means that we have not been able to split the data according to all given classifiers. Instead, we have submitted the information in a higher aggregation level, i.e. we combined quarters, vessel length groups, subdivisions and/or mesh sizes . Otherwise, the data would in many cases refer to a single vessel. The Council Regulation EC 199/2008, Article 20 (4), says that a Member State may refuse to transmit the relevant data if there is a risk of natural persons and/or legal entities of being identified. Further, the same Article states that a Member State has the right to propose alternative means, which ensure anonymity, to meet the needs of the end-users. For some years we have tried to open discussion with JRC on how to transmit the data in such a way that data would fulfill JRC needs, but not allow identification of natural persons or legal entities. We are in the opinion that in this particular case our procedure is in accordance with the Council Regulation EC 199/2008.	The MS reply seems to be acceptable. However, the end-user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies.	Unknown
354	JRC	2014	Effort		For data supplied for 2013: Some data submitted in format inconsistent with the definitions of the data call. Affected records aggregated and missing mesh size, mesh size/gear, mesh size/gear/quarter, mesh size/gear/quarter/vessel length, mesh size/gear/quarter/vessel length/area & rectangle depending on level of aggregation. Table C, effort by rectangle: Effort of passive gears from vessels < 10m incompatible with data request (soaking time recorded not days at sea). Table E, landings by rectangle: contains entries for rectangle " " when data affected by confidentiality issue. Data supplied in this way can not be used.	HIGH	COVERAGE	As in issues 349-353. In addition, it is unclear to us what is the meaning of the comment: soaking time recorded not days at sea. In our answer, effort in table C was given in units asked in the data call, which is fishing hours and/or hours fished.	MS has highlighted difficulties in adhering to the data call, when dealing with a small fleet, these concerns are understandable. However there appears to be further problems with the submitted data apart from the number of small number of vessels. Finland should review the data provided in Tables C and E to ensure they match the format requested in the data call, and resubmit if necessary. However, the end-user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies.	Unknown
1052	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	fle-2732: Previous results (ICES, 2014c) indicate that landings in the recreational fishery are large enough to influence the flounder populations in this assessment unit. However, better estimates from the recreational fishery are needed, with respective estimates of uncertainty.	MEDIUM	QUALITY	Recreational estimates are done every second year. There is nothing for 2013 and 2014 is not ready yet. This message has been sent to the fle-2732 stock-coordinator, which she has approved. The harvest of flounder in Finland has declined over time from 374 t in 2000 to 38 t in 2012, with a CV of 13 and 32%. Although the CVs are higher than the 20% advised for the DCF, the results are believed to be robust as the design of this survey is adequate and these estimates should be included in stock assessment. (ICES WGRFS REPORT 2014).	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1390	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	tur-2232: Catch data, including discards, need to be improved to get a better understanding of the state of turbot in the Baltic Sea. Biological data would be required to distinguish stock components.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Finnish catches of turbot are negligible (5 t in 2013).	MS reply is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1502	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	cod-2532: Ageing discrepancies between countries have been recognised for a long time but the recent trend in growth rate may have increased the consequence of this problem.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Finnish catches of cod less than 1% of total. No sampling.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1510	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	cod-2532: Removals of cod in recreational fisheries in the Baltic Sea are currently neither consistently nor completely sampled.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	See flounder (ID 1052).	Finland has not replied to this comment, however this is a general comment from WGBFAS, which is not directed at any MS. Finland has relatively low recreational cod catches.	Satisfactory

FRANCE										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
340	JRC	2014	Aquaculture		Provided a full set of economic variables on aquaculture segment level for 2010-2012, however due to some missing variables for some minor segments (representing around 5-7% of overall national turnover) it has not been possible for the country to provide all indicators on the national level covering 100% of the production.	LOW	UNKNOWN	France already informed in NP and reports that collection of economic data on aquaculture could start from 2010 onwards. Actually it does not seem possible to provide 2008 and 2009 data retrospectively.	Answer from MS is not consistent with the data issue	Unknown
341	JRC	2014	Aquaculture		France started to report full data sets (with all economic variables) from 2010. As France is one of the major producers in some specific segment, 2008-2009 data are currently removed from some of the trends analyses for the period 2008-2012. The issue has been raised already in the past and it is unlikely that it could be solved retrospectively.	HIGH	UNKNOWN	See answer to question line #78	MS comment should not be a reference to some line; there should be a clear text with a response to issue. However, the issue has been already assessed last year and the assesement was that this is satisfactory	Satisfactory
409	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		No data provided on inactive vessels for all years. Impact: Incomplete times series; national, EU and regional analysis	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Data on inactive vessels were omitted in 2014, They have been included for all years in the 2015 data call.	Submission for DCF is mandatory for all variables and segments unless MS has a derogation.	Unsatisfactory
410	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Estimated fleet depreciated replacement value missing at national and fleet segment levels for 2008 and 2009. Impact: Incomplete times series; HIGH EU and regional analysis; unable to estimate economic indicators	HIGH	UNKNOWN	The PIM method was applied to calculate depreciated replacement values for years 2010 to 2012. It could not be applied for 2008 and 2009 because of technical difficulties and lack of reliable input data.	Submission for DCF is mandatory for all variables and segments unless MS has a derogation. Price per capacity unit for the years 2008 and 2009 could be estimated on the basis of PIM calculation for the years 2010-2012	Unsatisfactory
411	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Effort and Landings data not submitted for 2013. Impact: Incomplete national fleet and EU overview coverage; unable to estimate projections for 2014	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Effort and landings data per segment for 2013 were not available at the time of the data call. France mentioned in the NP that the segmentation of the fleet for year n is determined in October n+1.	MS answer is justified considering that NP set the deadline for providing effort and landings data only in October n+1	Satisfactory
412	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Effort data (fishing days and days at sea) not provided for 2008 and 2009, at national and fleet segment levels. Impact: Incomplete national fleet and EU overview coverage; incomplete time series analysis	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Data non available for 2008 and 2009	MS reply does not explain the reason for no submission of data. No justification provided	Unsatisfactory
413	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Limited data provided for fleet segments operating in OFR (Other fishing regions) and significant amount of missing data for several fleet segment operating in AREA27 and AREA37. Impact: Incomplete national fleet coverage, compromises EU overview and regional analyses; unable to estimate economic indicators	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Difficulties to collect data in overseas territories	Submission for DCF is mandatory for all supra-regions unless MS has a derogation. Insufficient justification provided by MS	Unsatisfactory
414	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Effort data provided only for 2010 for the distant water fleet, energy consumption and landings data not reported for 2008. Impact: Incomplete times series and EU overview	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Difficulties to collect data in overseas territories. Landing data and energy consumption were provided for 2008.	Submission for DCF is mandatory for all variables and segments unless MS has a derogation. Difficulties in collecting data cannot be considered a justification for not providing data	Unsatisfactory
415	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Inconsistent use of clustering over the time period. Impact: Incomplete/inaccurate times series analyses	HIGH	COVERAGE	This issue could not be tackled last year because of lack of time. Clusters have been revised in 2015, so that new time series be consistent.	France acknowledges the problems in clustering procedures. The lack of time cannot be considered a valid justification	Unsatisfactory
416	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Considerable amount of data submitted on 23/07/2014, well after the deadline	HIGH	QUALITY	The delay in providing some variables was due to technical and methodological difficulties.	MS should ensure that data call deadlines are respected. No indication is given on the actions taken to avoid late submission from 2015 onwards	Unsatisfactory
33	GFCM	2014	[ None ]	Task 1.3	61% completed - no data on the vessel value of the total fleet and the working hours/day (0%)	LOW	COVERAGE	This form have been completed at 61Å % because some data were considered as non reliable and not used to estimate the variables for some mÅtiers.	The explanation given by MS could be considered acceptable. Should be remarked that the GFCM Task 1 follow the concept of the operational unit and not the metier as reported erroneously by MS in the answer. The end user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies	Unknown
34	GFCM	2014	[ None ]	Task 1.4	20% completed - no data on the gear units value, total effort and the catch/landing, discard and by-catch values of the fising periods, group by-catch species, by-catch weight, by-catch number and and CPUE/LPUE value of the main associated species (0%)	MEDIUM	COVERAGE	(1) For variables "gear units value", "total effort" et "CPUE/LPUE value", these variables involved data on gear size. As indicated in the French NP data on gear size are available but could not be taken into account. Some information are available concerning gear size for vessels <12m by implementing surveys (costly sampling plans). Work on these data is ongoing but it is still not possible to deliver these variables. (2) For variables Å«Å discard", "by-catch values", "group by-catch species", by-catch weight", by-catch number" and "CPUE/LPUE value" these variables are transmitted to STECF/MED but in reason of work overload it has not been possible to deliver these date in the appropriate format to the GFCM working group. These variables will be transmitted in 2015.	All the mentioned data (e.g. gear units, value", "total effort" and "CPUE/LPUE valueâ€ etc.) are not requested by GFCM at level of gear size as stated by MS. MS should better clarify this issue and submit the request data. Moreover, the end user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies	Unknown
35	GFCM	2014	[ None ]	Task 1.5	All Task 1.5 data- not provided (0%)	HIGH	COVERAGE	GFCM Task 1.5 ask for the transmission of minimum and maximum commercial size per species. These information have never been used by the working groups. See page 105 of the report of the Workshop on fisheries data collection in the Mediterranean Sea (Split, Croatia, 13-17 May 2013) https://gfcmsitestorage.blob.core.windows.net/documents/Reports/2013/GFCM-Report-2013-DataCollection-WCE-Med.pdf) : Recommendation : If agreed that these data should be used for assessment then: â€ time lag in the submission of the data should be minimized. â€ Different categories of priority species with different data requirements should be established (i.e.:species to be regularly assessed, species for which a rough monitoring is needed) and then specifications of data needed for each category and time frame should be further decided. If itâ€™s decided that data for stock assessment is submitted only through Stock Assessment Forms instead, task 1.5 may no longer be useful within the framework of Task 1.	The explanation given by MS is not acceptable. Despite it is true that this information have never been used by the working groups, France is a member of the GFCM and requested data should be submitted (i.e. mean length, max and min length, etc.) in agreement with the GFCM Recommendation. Such problems have been recurring on an annual basis for several years, and will hopefully be resolved once the new GFCM DCRF comes into force. For the time being MS should report the requested data	Unsatisfactory

FRANCE										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
36	GFCM	2014	[ None ]	Submission deadline	submitted all task 1 data 2 months late (01/08/2014)	MEDIUM	TIMELINESS	delay due to workload	The delay can be considered acceptable. However for the future, MS should try to submit the data respecting the established deadline. Should be remarked that all Task 1 data are not used by any working groups, but are only stored in a GFCM database.	Satisfactory
37	ICCAT	2014	[ None ]	T1NC: Nominal Catches	questionable data quality for all fleets and gear groups	LOW	QUALITY	We ascertain that current data sent by EU-France are reliable for all fleets and gear groups forms reported by CPCs had inconsistencies and failed SCRS filtering criteria but action should only be taken into account for DT year 2015	MS Reply is acceptable. The end user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies	Satisfactory
38	ICCAT	2014	[ None ]	T2CE: Catch and Effort	questionable data quality for all BFT gear groups	LOW	QUALITY	We ascertain that current data sent by EU-France are reliable for the catch by gear groups and for efforts. There is no reliable estimates for purse seiner efforts since it is very difficult to calculate them.	MS answer can be considered acceptable. Problems linked to the effort estimates for purse seiner should be investigated between MS, End user and DGMARE. The end user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies	Satisfactory
39	ICCAT	2014	[ None ]	T2SW/CAS: Catch-at size	no data on albacore for BB fleet, no data (HL fleet) or questionable data (BB and TW fleets) on bluefin tuna, no data for blue marlin and yellow fin tuna (UN fleets)	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	(1) Albacore : tasks 2, 3, 4 et 5 for 2014 and historical data 1989/1998 and 1967/1986 have been transmitted by France to the european Commission in May 2015. The work of rebuilding the time series lead by France is a significant step in the historical knowledge of these fisheries. // (2) Bluefin : CAS for baitboats and trawlers (Atlantic) have been transmitted. As French longliners represent less than <2% of total TAC, it is admitted by the working group that this information is not usefull for stock assessment // (3) Blue marlin: CAS for BUM have not been transmitted. Nevertheless, this issue is scientifically tackled in the paper ICCAT/SCRS/2014/070 Donn�es statistiques de la p�che du marlin bleu aux Antilles fran�aises (Guadeloupe et Martinique) proposition de reconstitution d�une s�rie historique. Considering the high number of landing sites it appears very difficult to put in place a sampling plan for biological data. // (4) Yellowfin : Variables concerning this species have been estimated. Cross-checking of the data is ongoing and a transmission of the requested forms may be possible in the short term.	The end user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies. MS should to take appropriate measures to prepare and provide data	Unknown
40	RCM	2014	[ None ]	NS&EA: comercial landings, effort and sampling	failed to upload data to the RDB	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	French data have been transmitted to the regional coordination group. Nevertheless as precised in a written note to the Commission, France have asked for information concerning data policy and juridical status of the regional database and considers that these issues have to be treated before saving the French data in the database.	This is a political issue, which should be clarified by proper authorities. Issue to be investigated by DGMARE	Unknown
41	RCM	2014	[ None ]	NS&EA: comercial landings, effort and sampling	missing data on commercial landings and commercial effort for RY 2009 and missing data on commercial samplings for RY 2009-2011	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE		No response by the MS. France to clarify why the data was not transmitted	Unsatisfactory
42	DG MARE	2014	[ None ]	Seabass/Effort	Late response	HIGH	TIMELINESS	Until November 5th 2014 many informal exchanges have been necessary between France and the Commission to precise the format requested for the data. Data have been treated after more precise specification by the Commission of the format.	Hopeful this will not be a problem in the future as the specifications is assumed to be in place now.	Unknown
43	DG MARE	2014	[ None ]	Seabass/Effort	Unable to match effort and catch to sub rectangle.	HIGH	QUALITY	Initial data call requested fishing effort in days at sea. This format does not allow to evaluate the number of fishing day (1) by trip (2) by statistical rectangle	MS to provide the data as requested	Unsatisfactory
355	JRC	2014	Effort		No landings by rectangle data for 2003-2010.	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Landings data by statistical rectangle (table D) are provided in time since they are requested, i.e. since 2012. These data were not demanded before. Within the dedicated time to process the data, it was not possible in 2014 to reconstitute the time series over the period 2003-2010.	MS to provide landings data by ICES rectangle for future data calls as requested	Unsatisfactory
356	JRC	2014	Effort		Table A, catch: no age information for 2009-2012 data; age info for cod only 2013 data.	HIGH	UNKNOWN	An effort has been done in 2014 to provide some age structure of catches for the year 2013. This effort will be continued in 2015 with more stocks	MS has to take appropriate measures to prepare and provide data in due time	Unsatisfactory
357	JRC	2014	Effort		Table A catch: No discard data for 2003-2009 or 2012.	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Discards data for 2013 were provided in time. An important effort was then made to provide time series of discards over the period 2010-2012 in eaction of the WG complaining on the bad quality or non availability of these data. These new sets of data were provided before the 2ndEWG (September), but it was not possible, in the time period available, to reconstitute longer time series (2003-2009).	MS has to take appropriate measures to prepare and provide data in due time	Unsatisfactory
358	JRC	2014	Effort		Table A catch: no split of special condition CPart13 into CPart13a-d for 2009-2011.	HIGH	COVERAGE	Data subdivided following article 13 of the cod management plan were provided in time. For the years before 2012, the data requested split for special condition CPart13 were provided in time, but not subdivided following article 13 of the cod management plan. The reason why the extra work for the years 2009-2011 could not be done during the time given.	MS has to take appropriate measures to prepare and provide data in due time	Unsatisfactory
359	JRC	2014	Effort		Table B, Effort: no fishing activity data for 2000-2009.	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Fishing activity is is provided in time since 2011. During the time given for processing the data, it was not possible to include the supplementary information on fishing activity for the years 2000-2009.	MS has to take appropriate measures to prepare and provide data in due time	Unsatisfactory

FRANCE										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
360	JRC	2014	Effort		Table B, Effort: no fishing capacity data for 2000-2011.	HIGH	UNKNOWN	There is a substisting difficulty in providing the demanded information following the different management plans in tonnage GT or in KW. It would be more relevant and more simple to distinguish these two measures with two columns. The supplementary data is provided on time since 2013. During the time given for processing the data, it was not possible to include the supplementary information on fishing activity for the years 2000-2011.	MS has to take appropriate measures to prepare and provide data in due time	Unsatisfactory
361	JRC	2014	Effort		Table C, effort by rectangle and Table E, landings by rectangle: records with missing rectangle information in years for which data is supplied.	HIGH	UNKNOWN	In certain cases, the rectangle information issued from the declarative forms is not available or not exploitable. In these cases, the data provided in tables C and E is noted '-1' for consistency with information provided in other tables. This only concerns a minor percentage of the data.	MS reply is acceptable.	Satisfactory
362	JRC	2014	Effort		Re-submission of data less than one week before second EWG.	HIGH	QUALITY	In order to address the feedback from the group on discards data quality provided for the years 2010-2011 and on the non providing of discards data in 2012, a special effort was made to estimate discards over the period 2010-2012. These revised data could only be available one week before the start of the 2ndEWG, but they were considered as of much better quality than the previous data. The respect of the deadline remains a major concern when answering the data calls, and we're hopeful this will be achieved in the short term.	MS has to take appropriate measures to prepare and provide data in due time	Unsatisfactory
464	JRC	2014	Med and BS		Complete absence of fisheries data for GSA 8	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Following the feedback from the Commission on the non providing of data for GSA08 (Corsica), an exploratory analysis was done on declarative data available in order to develop a methodology and a work plan for answering the demand. A series of transversal data (derived from the declarative forms and the fishing calendar survey) for Corsica is under construction in order to answer the forthcoming Med&BS datacall over the longest possible time series.	MS answer could be justified assuming that the requested data will be made available for future data calls. End user should verify and reports to DGMARE, if during the forthcoming data calls data for GSA 8 will be available.Â	Unknown
465	JRC	2014	Med and BS		No effort data before 2012, none from GSA 8	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Effort data could be estimated for the years 2012 and 2013, but not for the previous years, during the time given by the datacall. A work plan is currently being developed to estimate the effort time series in order to answer the forthcoming Med&BS datacall over the longest possible time series.	MS reply is acceptable, assumingÂ the requested effortÂ data will be made available for future data calls.	Satisfactory
466	JRC	2014	Med and BS		Effort data and Catch data (Landings, Discards) are inconsistent: large effort values in many years-areas-gears are accompanied by very low or no catches at all	HIGH	COVERAGE	A work plan is currently being developed to improve the quality and consistency of transversal data time series (landings and effort) in order to answer the forthcoming Med&BS datacall over the longest possible time series.	MS answer could be justified assuming that the requested data will be made available for future data calls. End user should verify, and reports to DGMARE, if during the forthcoming data calls landing and effort data have been correctly revised and uploaded.	Unknown
467	JRC	2014	Med and BS		Only 5 species are declared in Discards data and only 11 species in the Catch data	HIGH	UNKNOWN	See answer to question line #100	MS answer is not acceptable. MS should clarify why so few species were reported in the catch and discards data. MS is requested not to refer to any lines in the national response as this line number cannot be identified during the review process.Â	Unsatisfactory
1014	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	anb-78ab: Efforts should be made to obtain reliable estimates of total catches in order to improve the assessment.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This issue relates to the availability and quality of discards estimates. France monitors the fisheries catching anglerfish in the Atlantic, and is able to provide discards data to the working group	MS answer is acceptable. This is not a country specific issue. This type of issues has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1037	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WBGIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	anb-78ab: Accurate estimates of growth parameters are needed to facilitate the development of an analytical assessment.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	A project has been proposed by Portugal to better estimate the age, and it will be followed by a workshop. France is participating to this study.	MS answer is acceptable. This is not a country specific issue. This type of issues has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1044	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	anb-78ab: increased discarding in recent years has resulted in uncertainties in recent catch values. An increase in the discard sampling level is necessary for providing catch advice.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	See answer to question line #4	MS answer is acceptable. This is not a country specific issue. This type of issues has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls. The MS is requested not to refer to any lines in the national response as this line number cannot be identified during the review.	Satisfactory
1078	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	gug-89a: The data for catches of grey gurnard are considered highly unreliable. Catch statistics are incomplete and are often not separated by species.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	See answer to question line #12	MS answer is acceptable. Possible ways to solve the problem should be requested to the relevant RCM and supported by the COM. The MS is requested not to refer to any lines in the national response as this line number cannot be identified during the review.	Satisfactory
1101	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: HAWG. EcoRegion: North Sea	her-47d3: ICES is concerned about the lack of information on unallocated removals in all herring fisheries; efforts should be made to maintain observer coverage across fleets that catch a substantial proportion of pelagic fish and to report on these issues. Introduction of the EU landing obligation may change this situation.	MEDIUM	COVERAGE	The French observers at sea programme includes the sampling of these fisheries. Big pelagic trawlers, which landed their catches in Ijmuiden, are monitored by the Netherlands through theFrench-Dutch bilateral agreement.	MS answer is acceptable. General concern, which should be directed to relevant RCM.	Satisfactory
1121	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	hke-nrth: Assessment data arrived after the ICES data call deadline, thus reducing time to review and audit the assessment results. Although the data were used, the delay may reduce ICES quality assurance.	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	See answer to question line #8	MS answer is acceptable. The MS is requested not to refer to any lines in the national response as this line number cannot be identified during the review.	Satisfactory



FRANCE										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1130	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	hke-nrth: Only partial discards are included in the assessment and forecast. In order to reduce uncertainty in discard estimates, an increased sampling level for on-board observer programmes is needed for some fleets (non-Nephrops trawlers, gillnetters, and longliners).	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	France is doing its part, the cited fleets are included in the French on-board sampling programme and discards estimates are provided to the working group	MS answer is acceptable. This is not a country specific issue. This type of issues has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls. The MS is requested not to refer to any lines in the national response as this line number cannot be identified during the review.	Satisfactory
1139	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	hke-nrth: There is large uncertainty associated with the estimation of discards. Hake otoliths are currently collected but not used in the assessment due to lack of a validated ageing method. The utility of the current sampling and its level should be re-evaluated.	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN	It is up to the working group to send a clear message to all MS involved, whether data collection for age should be continued or not.	MS answer is acceptable. This is not a country specific issue. This type of issues has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls. The MS is requested not to refer to any lines in the national response as this line number cannot be identified during the review.	Satisfactory
1144	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	hke-nrtn: 2013 landings, discard and biological sampling data on landings and discard not submitted in time to WGBIE data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	See answer to question line #8	MS answer is acceptable. The MS is requested not to refer to any lines in the national response as this line number cannot be identified during the review.	Satisfactory
1145	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	hke-soth: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGBIE data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	See answer to question line #8	MS answer is acceptable. The MS is requested not to refer to any lines in the national response as this line number cannot be identified during the review.	Satisfactory
1153	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	hom-nsea: When considering the potential mixing of Western and North Sea horse mackerel in Division VIId, better information on the biological origin of catches from that area would greatly improve the quality of future scientific advice and, consequently, management of the North Sea horse mackerel stock.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	The majority of the French catches of small pelagics, including horse mackerel is landed in the Netherlands, and sampling is covered by a bilateral agreement.	MS answer is acceptable. This is not a country specific issue. This type of issues has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls. The MS is requested not to refer to any lines in the national response as this line number cannot be identified during the review.	Satisfactory
1162	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	hom-west: As in previous years, and despite the data sampling regulations for EU countries, some countries with major catches have not conducted biological sampling programmes.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	What is considered major catches? France is contributing to about 6% of the catch in VIId.	MS answer is acceptable. This is general comment from WG not addressed to any MS in particular.	Satisfactory
1171	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	hom-west: Not all countries provide data on discards; consequently, there is no estimate of the total amount of discards in the horse mackerel fisheries.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	France has less than 5% of the catch quotas of Horse mackerel in western waters	MS answer is acceptable. This is general comment from WG not addressed to any MS in particular.	Satisfactory
1195	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	mac-nea: Limited sampling for discards has been carried out since 2000, despite a formal requirement initiated in the EU in 2002. Estimating the discarded and slipped proportions of catch is problematic in pelagic fisheries due to high variability in discard and slipping practices. In some fleets no sampling for discards is carried out, including those fleets for which discarding is illegal. The discards included in the catch in the assessment are an underestimate.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	The artisanal fleet is routinely monitored along the shore of France, and data is available	MS answer is acceptable. This is general comment from WG not addressed to any MS in particular.	Satisfactory
1233	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	mur-west: Regular biological sampling of striped red mullet catches is expected to continue under the EU Data Collection Framework, but the frequency is currently insufficient to calculate catch-at-age outside the Bay of Biscay and Divisions VIId and VIIe.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	IS the question related to a stock attributed to WGWIDE or to strip red mullet in western waters, which is assessed by WGNW? Biological parameters for red mullet is only taken during the scientific surveys, some financed under DCF (EVHOE), others not.	MS answer is acceptable. This is general comment from WG not addressed to any MS in particular.	Satisfactory
1252	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WBGIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	anp-78ab: An increase in the discard sampling level is necessary for providing catch advice.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Discards of anglerfish are monitored routinely, and french data are being provided to the WG	MS answer is acceptable. This is general comment from WG not addressed to any MS in particular.	Satisfactory

FRANCE										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1277	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	anp-78ab: Accurate estimates of growth parameters are needed to facilitate the development of an analytical assessment	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	We are waiting for an international agreement to resume age interpretation	MS answer is acceptable. This is general comment from WG not addressed to any MS in particular.	Satisfactory
1295	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	ple-89a: There are concerns about the reliability of the 2008%-2009 French data. Landings statistics need to be quality assured and confirmed for the region, and associated effort should be compiled.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	French statistics system has changed in 2009, creating problems for that particular year. Effort has been made to quality control the statistics in subsequent years and is now considered totally reliable.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1299	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	anp-78ab: Reliable estimates of discards are not available	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	France has processed the discards data for 2014 and provided them to the WG	MS answer is acceptable. This is general comment from WG not addressed to any MS in particular.	Satisfactory
1317	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	pol-89a: Data on growth, maturity, and discards from the fisheries are needed.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This type of data is currently being processed, with the help of a PhD who started her work in October 2014. Biological parameters of pol-89a is being collected and methodological developments are ongoing for assessing this stock.	MS answer is acceptable. This is general comment from WG not addressed to any MS in particular.	Satisfactory
1321	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	pol-89a: Recreational catches of pollack may be substantial but are not quantified.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Pollack is not actually a species for which monitoring of catches by recreational fisheries is requested in the DCF regulation.	MS answer is acceptable. This is general comment from WG not addressed to any MS in particular.	Satisfactory
1418	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	whg-89a: There are concerns about the reliability of the 2008%-2009 French data. Landings statistics need to be quality assured and confirmed for the region.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	See answer to question line #42	MS Reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1460	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	bss-8ab: Historical sampling of the commercial catches is of variable quality and data sampling should cover all fleets involved in this fishery. Time-series of relative abundance indices are needed for both the adult and pre-recruit components of the stock	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	A series of length and age structure is now available since 2000. Lots of initiatives are ongoing for this stock (tagging, juvenile surveys, LPUE indices, â€¦) which should be very helpful in support of the assessment WG	MS answer is acceptable. This is general comment from WG not addressed to any MS in particular.	Satisfactory
1464	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	bss-8ab: Recreational fisheries are likely to contribute substantially to fishery removals in some areas. Time-series of catches, releases, and size/age composition are needed from this component of the fishery to improve the assessment and advice.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	See answer to question line #50	MS answer is acceptable. This is general comment from WG not addressed to any MS in particular.	Satisfactory
1023	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	cod-347d: The Danish REX, UK northeast coast, and UK whitefish surveys have all been discontinued due to lack of funding. Such surveys require sustained support for at least five years in order for their outputs to be considered for inclusion in stock assessments as time-series indices.	MEDIUM	QUALITY	France is currently reformatting its surveys to ensure the continuity of time series. The reformatting of the French surveys has been presented at the IBTWG in 2014 and 2015.	Specific comment not relevant for France. Nice to know that France surveys time series are maintained.	Satisfactory
1031	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	cod-347d: Unaccounted removals are no longer estimated for 2006 onwards. The main sources of uncertainty are aspects of the input data (historical landings and discards; discrepancies between stock trends implied by the age structure of the commercial catch and surveys) and the assumption of fishing mortality and recruitment in the advice forecast. SSB has been overestimated in previous years.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This is a modelling issue and a retrospective bias in SSB scrutinised during the last benchmark. France provides the best possible information to the working group.	MS answer is acceptable. Such very general statement from the WG is very difficult to comment on in relation to a specific country. Agreed coordinated actions must be implemented through future data calls. This type of issue has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1039	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCSE. EcoRegion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland	cod-scow: 2013 landing not submitted in time to WGCSE data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Early 2013, IFREMER has initiated a new procedure in order to better respond to data calls and deliver data to end-users. Part of this procedure was the appointment of a dedicated engineer, the creation of an expert network and the development of writing protocols for each of the calls to ensure quality and repeatability. With this procedure, France improved the number of stocks and quality of data provided to end-users since 2014, but is still struggling to meet the deadlines defined, although the working groups all received the data before the beginning of their meeting. Recent improvements in the data flows allow to be optimistic for delivering all data to end-users in full respect of the deadlines in the short term.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory

FRANCE										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1040	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	dab-nea: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	See answer to question line #8	The MS must not refer to any lines in the national response as this line number cannot be identified during the review. Answer is only acceptable as data were submitted before workshop.	Satisfactory
1057	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	fle-nsea: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	See answer to question line #8	The MS must not refer to any lines in the national response as this line number cannot be identified during the review. Answer is only acceptable as data were submitted before workshop.	Satisfactory
1073	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	gug-347d: Species misidentification continues to be a major problem in estimating the landings of all gurnards and hence grey gurnard. In addition, discarding is estimated to be high	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This is a long time issue, the only reliable information comes from surveys (recommendation in advice sheet 2013) and on-board observers (recommendation in advice sheet 2014). France will be pleased to participate to any project aimed at improving the data for this stock.	MS answer is acceptable. Such very general statement from the WG is very difficult to comment on in relation to a specific country. Agreed coordinated actions must be implemented through future data calls. This type of issue has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1086	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	had-346a: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but until workshop day. Discard and biological sampling data missing.	LOW	TIMELINESS	See answer to question line #8 for timeliness. France is catching 0.5% of this stock (ICES advice sheet 2014),and thus does not collect biological data.	MS answer is acceptable. The MS must not refer to any lines in the national response as this line number cannot be identified during the review.	Satisfactory
1090	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCSE. EcoRegion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland	had-7b-k: 2013 landings, discard and biological sampling data of landings and discard not submitted in time to WGCSE data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	See answer to question line #8	Assuming that the referred answer to question #8 is the answer to Id 1039, the answer is acceptable. The MS is requested not to refer to any lines in the national response as this line number cannot be identified during the review.	Satisfactory
1164	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCSE. EcoRegion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland	ang-ivi: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGCSE data call submission deadline, but until workshop day - discard, and biological sampling data on landings and discrad missing	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	See answer to question line #8 for timeliness. There is no ageing information to be provided for this stock.	Assuming that the referred answer to question #8 is the answer to Id 1039, the answer is acceptable. The MS is requested not to refer to any lines in the national response as this line number cannot be identified during the review.	Satisfactory
1182	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	lin-oth: 2013 landings not submitted to 1st workgroup day through InterCatch. However, landings available on the EG sharepoint one month before the meeting (on 03/03/2014)	LOW	TIMELINESS	Because of the large number of stock in WGDEEP, most of which with landings only data the group used to have files for all landings by ICES division and country. These landings data were available one month before the meeting on the group Sharepoint	If the data call request the MS to submit the data in a gspecified form then the MS should provide the data. The suitability of the format should be discussed in another forum.	Satisfactory
1201	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCSE. EcoRegion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland	meg-4a6a: missing discards data, however the assessment is not sensitive to the lack of discards data; the lack of these data has minimal impact on fishing mortality estimates and results in a slight higher estimate of biomass	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	If discards data is not useful to the assessment, the working group should not request for discards information	If the data call request the MS to submit discard estimates then the MS should provide the data. Relevance or not for the assessment should be discussed in another forum.	Unsatisfactory
1209	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCSE. EcoRegion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland	mgw-78: Assessment data arrived after the ICES data call deadline, thus reducing time to review and audit the assessment results.	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	See answer to question line #8	Assuming that the referred answer to question #8 is the answer to Id 1039, the answer is acceptable. The MS is requested not to refer to any lines in the national response as this line number cannot be identified during the review.	Satisfactory
1211	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCSE. EcoRegion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland	mgw-78: France, has not provided discards estimates since 1999. Because of that total discard cannot be estimated and therefore ICES provides landings advice, instead of catch advice.	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	See answer to question line #8	The MS answer and the categorization of the issue seems not to be in line with the issue. MS should provide discard estimated if the DCF dictate the MS to do so.	Unsatisfactory
1219	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGMIXFISH-ADVCE. EcoRegion: North Sea	mix-fish: Mixed-fisheries analysis and projections critically rely on data being available on time to allow sufficient quality checking and preparation. Some data were submitted only shortly before the meeting, which limited the possibilities for additional data investigations.	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Data were submitted on time. This comment does not apply to France	Such very general statement is very difficult to comment on in relation to a specific country and the answer is assumed to be acceptable.	Satisfactory
1222	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	mur-347d: 2013 landings and biological sampling data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	The stock coordinator is French and chose the appropriate timing to prepare the data	This might not be acceptable as other countries should have the possibility to check the compiled data in due time before the WG. However, if the Stock Coordinator was aware in advance that other MS data was not yet available then this decision is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1236	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	nep-10-Nov (FU10), The time-series of UWTW survey data is incomplete and no survey has been conducted since 2007. There are no reliable effort data for this FU and therefore no resulting lpue.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Not relevant for France	MS answer is acceptable. However, this is a general comment which should not have been sent out to all MS.	Satisfactory
1238	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCSE. EcoRegion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland	Nep-19: 2013 landings not submitted before WGCSE workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	See answer to question line #8	Assuming that the referred answer to question #8 is the answer to Id 1039, the answer is acceptable. The MS is requested not to refer to any lines in the national response as this line number cannot be identified during the review.	Satisfactory
1268	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCSE. EcoRegion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland	nep-VII-FU16: Discard observer coverage is low and should be increased, to better sample the landings and any discards that might be occurring.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Not relevant for France, since there is very few fisheries in Porcupine (<10 t. since 2009, source ICES advice)	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory

FRANCE										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1272	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	ory-comb: the stock recovery cannot be monitored with current monitoring data	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	For most countries (including France) current monitoring data include spatial distribution of fisheries and discards from on-board observations. As the fishery for ORY is closed and the species is agregative in particular habitats, discards in current fisheries (i.e. for other species) are minor. Data from fisheries in recent years were however used to evaluate the impact of current fisheries using a PSA (Productivity Susceptibility Analysis). The level of impact was considered sustainable by the stock. Owing to the slow dynamics of the species, short term change in stock status are not expected. In other words, data collected under the DCF were available and used by WGDEEP. These data cannot inform on stock status, which is not expected to display significant annual and even short-term (3-5 years) variations. It may not be realistic to develop a monitoring of this species and the current monitoring allows evaluating whether the levels of impact of current fisheries remains minor or not.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1289	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCSE. EcoRegion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland	ple-7h-k: The assessment is carried out on the landings in Divisions Vlijk and there is no information other than landings from the component in Division VIIh of the TAC area. ICES is unable to assess stock trends in Division VIIh.	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	This information should be requested during a benchmark procedure. All data in France is available at the statistical rectangle level and may be processed on demand.	MS answer is acceptable, but issue type might be wrong.	Satisfactory
1292	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCSE. EcoRegion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland	ple-7h-k: The assessment is only based on age 4 and older; ICES does not have reliable information on younger ages.	LOW	TIMELINESS	France is fishing less than 50 tonnes of plaice in this area, mostly in VIIh, and has no plan to collect biological information for this stock	MS answer is acceptable. Possible ways to solve the problem should be requested to the relevant RCM	Satisfactory
1302	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland	ple-eche: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	See answer to question line #8	The MS must not refer to any lines in the national response as this line number cannot be identified during the review. Answer is only acceptable as data were submitted before workshop.	Satisfactory
1304	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	ple-eche: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	See answer to question line #8	The MS must not refer to any lines in the national response as this line number cannot be identified during the review. Answer is only acceptable as data were submitted before workshop.	Satisfactory
1306	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCSE. EcoRegion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland	ple-echw: 2013 landings and biological sampling data of landings not submitted in time to WGCSE data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	See answer to question line #8	Assuming that the referred answer to question #8 is the answer to Id 1039, the answer is acceptable. The MS is requested not to refer to any lines in the national response as this line number cannot be identified during the review.	Satisfactory
1307	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCSE. EcoRegion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland	ple-echw: There is a heavy reliance on the biological sampling data derived from UK(E+W) sample data, with 30% of landings being unsampled. would benefit from the addition of biological sampling data from France and Belgium who collectively account for 30% of the landings	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	France has initiated the collection of age information for plaice in Vile for the first quarter, which is the most important quarter of the year.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1309	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	ple-nsea: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	See answer to question line #8	The MS must not refer to any lines in the national response as this line number cannot be identified during the review. Answer is only acceptable as data were submitted before workshop.	Satisfactory
1323	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	pol-nsea: ICES now considers that discards are known to take place, but can only be quantified for part of the landings.	MEDIUM	QUALITY	Marginal catches of pollock are issued from North Sea in France.	ICES comment is too general. MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1332	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	rng-5b67: The current assessment method does not use catches from Division XIIb. Exploratory assessments were carried out using these data but are not yet considered to be reliable for advice. Fishing activity in Division XIIb currently may contribute to around 30% of the catch. The actual level of catch has been considered uncertain for several years because of problems with species reporting and misreporting to/from other areas. As this issue strongly impacts the quality of the assessment, it is necessary that substantial efforts are made to increase the monitoring of the fishery operating in Division XIIb. Countries fishing in XIIb should report reliable landings data. Countries not fishing should report 0 landings and/or 0 effort.	HIGH	QUALITY	No catch from France in XIIb in recent years, the comment refers to others countries.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory



## FRANCE

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1333	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	rng-5b67: The current assessment method does not use catches from Division XIlb. Exploratory assessments were carried out using these data but are not yet considered to be reliable for advice. Fishing activity in Division XIlb currently may contribute to around 30% of the catch. The actual level of catch has been considered uncertain for several years because of problems with species reporting and misreporting to/from other areas. As this issue strongly impacts the quality of the assessment, it is necessary that substantial efforts are made to increase the monitoring of the fishery operating in Division XIlb. Countries fishing in XIlb should report reliable landings data. Countries not fishing should report 0 landings and/or 0 effort.	HIGH	QUALITY	See answer to question line #52	It is not clear what line 52 refers to. The MS must not refer to any lines in the national response as this line number cannot be identified during the review.	Unknown
1340	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	rng-oth: This assessment unit consists of a number of discrete areas in which only very small catches of roundnose grenadier occur. Improvement of the advice for the stock will require regular data collection by observers on board commercial vessels. The required information must contain data on gear type, length%-age composition, maturation and feeding of the species, spatial distribution, as well as size and composition of catches, effort, and discards. This information should be presented to ICES annually.	LOW	QUALITY	In this assessment unit total landings were 80-120 t in 2011-13, about 80% of which were from Iceland in Va and the further 20% mostly from Norway in Subareas I and II. French landings in 2011-13 were one tonne FOR THE 3 YEARS COMBINED.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1345	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	rng-rest: 2013 I landings not submitted to 1st workgroup day through InterCatch. However, landings available on the EG sharepoint one month before the meeting (on 03/03/2014)	LOW	TIMELINESS	See answer to question line #8.	Assuming that the referred answer to question #8 is the answer to Id 1039, the answer is acceptable. The MS is requested not to refer to any lines in the national response as this line number cannot be identified during the review.	Satisfactory
1347	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	rng-soth: 2013 landings not submitted to 1st workgroup day through InterCatch. However, landings available on the EG sharepoint one month before the meeting (on 03/03/2014)	LOW	TIMELINESS	See answer to question line #8.	Assuming that the referred answer to question #8 is the answer to Id 1039, the answer is acceptable. The MS is requested not to refer to any lines in the national response as this line number cannot be identified during the review.	Satisfactory
1349	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	sai-3a46: 2013 landings and biological sampling data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day. No discard data.	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	See answer to question line #8	The MS must not refer to any lines in the national response as this line number cannot be identified during the review. Answer is only acceptable as data were submitted before workshop.	Satisfactory
1354	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	sbr-678: 2013 landings not submitted to 1st workgroup day through InterCatch. However, landings available on the EG sharepoint one month before the meeting (on 03/03/2014)	LOW	TIMELINESS	See answer to question line #8	Assuming that the referred answer to question #8 is the answer to Id 1039, the answer is acceptable. The MS is requested not to refer to any lines in the national response as this line number cannot be identified during the review.	Satisfactory
1376	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	sol-eche: 2013 landings and biological sampling data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day. No discard data in InterCatch.	LOW	TIMELINESS	See answer to question line #8. Discards data were not requested by the WG, but discards rates by metiers were provided to the stock assessor.	Assuming that the referred answer to question #8 is the answer to Id 1039, the answer is acceptable. The MS is requested not to refer to any lines in the national response as this line number cannot be identified during the review.	Satisfactory
1381	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	sol-nsea: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	See answer to question line #8	Assuming that the referred answer to question #8 is the answer to Id 1039, the answer is acceptable. The MS is requested not to refer to any lines in the national response as this line number cannot be identified during the review.	Satisfactory
1383	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	srg-oth: 2013 landings not submitted to 1st workgroup day through InterCatch. However, landings available on the EG sharepoint one month before the meeting (on 03/03/2014)	LOW	TIMELINESS	See answer to question line #8	Assuming that the referred answer to question #8 is the answer to Id 1039, the answer is acceptable. The MS is requested not to refer to any lines in the national response as this line number cannot be identified during the review.	Satisfactory

FRANCE										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1405	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	usk-oth: 2013 landings not submitted to 1st workgroup day through InterCatch. However, landings available on the EG sharepoint one month before the meeting (on 03/03/2014)	LOW	TIMELINESS	See answer to question line #8	Assuming that the referred answer to question #8 is the answer to Id 1039, the answer is acceptable. The MS is requested not to refer to any lines in the national response as this line number cannot be identified during the review.	Satisfactory
1411	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	whg-47d: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	See answer to question line #8	The MS must not refer to any lines in the national response as this line number cannot be identified during the review. Answer is only acceptable as data were submitted before workshop.	Satisfactory
1416	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCSE. EcoRegion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland	whg-7e-k: 2013 landings, discard and biological sampling of discard and landings were not submitted in time to WGCSE data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	See answer to question line #8	Assuming that the referred answer to question #8 is the answer to Id 1039, the answer is acceptable. The MS is requested not to refer to any lines in the national response as this line number cannot be identified during the review.	Satisfactory
1421	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	bli-5b67: 2013 landings not submitted to 1st workgroup day through InterCatch. However, landings available on the EG sharepoint one month before the meeting (on 03/03/2014)	LOW	TIMELINESS	See answer to question line #8	Assuming that the referred answer to question #8 is the answer to Id 1039, the answer is acceptable. The MS is requested not to refer to any lines in the national response as this line number cannot be identified during the review.	Satisfactory
1425	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	wit-nsea: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	See answer to question line #8	The MS must not refer to any lines in the national response as this line number cannot be identified during the review. Answer is only acceptable as data were submitted before workshop.	Satisfactory
1434	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	bli-oth: 2013 landings not submitted to 1st workgroup day through InterCatch. However, landings available on the EG sharepoint one month before the meeting (on 03/03/2014)	LOW	TIMELINESS	See answer to question line #8	Assuming that the referred answer to question #8 is the answer to Id 1039, the answer is acceptable. The MS is requested not to refer to any lines in the national response as this line number cannot be identified during the review.	Satisfactory
1436	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	bll-nsea: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	See answer to question line #8	The MS must not refer to any lines in the national response as this line number cannot be identified during the review. Answer is only acceptable as data were submitted before workshop.	Satisfactory
1438	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	alf-comb: 2013 landings not submitted to 1st workgroup day through InterCatch. However, landings available on the EG sharepoint (as can be seen on the sharepoint) version history one month before the meeting (on 03/03/2014).	LOW	TIMELINESS	See answer to question line #8	Assuming that the referred answer to question #8 is the answer to Id 1039, the answer is acceptable. The MS is requested not to refer to any lines in the national response as this line number cannot be identified during the review.	Satisfactory
1446	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	bll-nsea: Fishery-independent surveys catch very few large brill, creating data gaps for the greater fish lengths. Commercial surveys could be developed to effectively monitor the full age and size spectrum of this species.	MEDIUM	QUALITY	No dedicated survey is conducted for brill. France provides data for 141 ICES stocks in 2014, and cannot design as many sampling plans. Random sampling is used as recommended by statistical working group, and brill is collected within this plan.	MS answer is acceptable. ICES comment is too general and should not be adressed as an data transmission failure. This type of issues has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1455	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	bsf-nea: 2013 landings not submitted to 1st workgroup day through InterCatch. However, landings available on the EG sharepoint one month before the meeting (on 03/03/2014)	LOW	TIMELINESS	See answer to question line #8	Assuming that the referred answer to question #8 is the answer to Id 1039, the answer is acceptable. The MS is requested not to refer to any lines in the national response as this line number cannot be identified during the review.	Satisfactory
1476	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCEPH. EcoRegion: NA	Cephalopods: data not delivered in time: survey data 2013 England and Wales, Discard data Wales, ALL data from France	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	See answer to question line #8	Assuming that the referred answer to question #8 is the answer to Id 1039, the answer is acceptable. The MS is requested not to refer to any lines in the national response as this line number cannot be identified during the review.	Satisfactory
1478	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCEPH. EcoRegion: NA	Cephalopods: France does not follow the data format designed by the group to data exchange and analysis. As the lack of accomplishment with the data call format, most of the variables about the fishery are not delivered by France.	MEDIUM	QUALITY	France exchanged by email with the WGCEPH chairs and tried its best to answer the demand. ICES should make sure all Assessment WG request data following the same format.	MS should ensure that all requested data are submitted on time and in the correct format for the data call.	Unsatisfactory
1483	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	alf-comb: The general absence of data on species composition of the catches and biological parameters are important limiting factors for the knowledge of these fish stocks.	MEDIUM	QUALITY	International landings in the NEA have been around 300 tonnes/year in2009-13. On the same period French landings have been 6-24 tonnes per year (i.e. insignificant level and less than 10% international). The bulk of landings are from Portugal in IXa and Xa and, to a lesser extend Spain in IX and VIII	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1490	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCEPH. EcoRegion: NA	Cephalopods: There is still a data clarification request process to be deployed in relation to: a) Species (even family level!) identification in the catches and landings (northern countries and France) b) Discards: more biological data related to cephalopods (already being collected by some countries). c) Discard data: sampled level for discard for submission. All data should be raised.	MEDIUM	QUALITY	See answer to question line #76	France should ensure that it is proactive in providing all requested supporting data to the WGCEPH data clarification request process	Unknown

FRANCE										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1515	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	cod-347d: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	See answer to question line #8	The MS must not refer to any lines in the national response as this line number cannot be identified during the review. Answer is only acceptable as data were submitted before workshop.	Satisfactory

GERMANY										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
417	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Only capacity data provided for the pelagic fleet over 40m (TM VL40XX) (confidentiality issues). Impact: Values for Germany do not provide a real national picture since a significant amount of the landings are not reported due to confidentiality issues	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Confidentiality issue. Segment is dominated by one company; DEU regards "weight of landings" as non confidential and provides the figures. DEU has spent considerable effort to find a solution for the remaining data (e.g. through clustering), but there is no meaningful option to provide them without violating confidentiality rights.	According to the end user comment there is a clear confidentiality problem. The issue is not relevant for the data submission failure and MS comment is justified.	Satisfactory
418	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Capital value missing for the inactive segment VL40XX for most years . Impact: Incomplete economic, time-series and national fleet analysis	HIGH	UNKNOWN	All data are collected/estimated. It was thus a reporting error, mainly due to the fact that mussel dredgers were included in capacity, but not in capital. Errors have been erased and correct data uploaded, not in, but on time.	Germany acknowledges that the data delivery was not on time for this variable for the inactive segment. However, it is clearly specified that correct data have been uploaded even if after the deadline.	Satisfactory
491	JRC	2014	Processing		The MS committed to collect data by segment according to the national program but did not provide it	LOW	UNKNOWN	Germany did not declare to collect data according the segmentation asked for in the respective data call. According to the NP, Germany does only present data for the companies with 20 and more employees. For the smaller enterprises, data are collected but not presented in order to check for significant developments in this small sector. The NP states: " IV B 1 (e) Sampling stratification and allocation scheme: As a census is planned, this part is dispensable for the 3% 20 employees segment. The segment with <20 employees will be addressed by a sample survey, where the units are chosen randomly, but as the response to the questionnaire is voluntary, a self-selection bias occurs. As this segment stands for less than 10 % of the sector in terms of turnover and employment, this problem may be neglected, as the reported values are from the segment with 3% 20 employees." Further explanations in the text of the NP declare that Germany in principal only distinguishes between two segments, less than 20 employees and equal or more than 20 employees. The smaller segment is due to historical reasons further segmented, but as the data are not reported, the under 20 segment is not relevant in this context. The 20 and more segment was put into the standard table for the NP according the proposed segments from COM Decision 2010/93/EU, Appendix XII, in order to show the population of the industry in Germany, but by no means it was intended to collect the data differently in the shown segments, as mentioned only for the non-reported, small segment below 20 employees. For the 20 and more segment, a census was shown as collection strategy in Table IV.B.1 and also stated in the text. Germany hopes that this clarifies the issue.	MS provided relatively sufficient justification. In National Program MS indicate a data collection scheme, based on census for enterprises 3% 20 employees as threshold, rather than stratifying population to DCF segments. However in table IVB1 of NP, collection of economic variables of processing industry is provided by segments. Therefore, submission of data is compatible with NP text, but not exactly compatible with NP table IVB1, which give a basis for DT issue. According to the other part of NP 'Table IV.B.1 indicates the segmentation of the population by persons employed.', which means, that MS is following the guidelines of the NP/AR is collecting data per segment.	Unknown
44	RCM	2014	[ None ]	NS&EA: comercial landings, effort and sampling	missing data on commercial landings and commercial effort for RY 2009 and missing data on commercial samplings for RY 2009-2010	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	Data have been (re-)uploaded to the RDB after the RCM NS&EA 2014, as there has been a data loss discovered during the RCM that could not be tracked.	Issue to be investigated by DGMARE (this issue can not be verified by EWG)	Unknown
45	RCM	2014	[ None ]	NS&EA:age and length data	the number of species in length samples in the RDB differed between before and after the extraction of sample records with no information from the RDB	UNKNOWN	QUALITY	Comment unclear. What does "before and after the extraction of sample records with no information from the RDB" mean? Germany regards the data submission to the RDB as complete. In order to solve such detailed problems, a direct communication between RDB technical management and MS would be more appropriate.	Issue raised by the RCM NS&EA is unclear. It seems that problem rather lies in the RDB than on MS' side. In order to solve such detailed problems, a direct communication between RDB technical management and MS would be more appropriate.	Unknown
46	RCM	2014	[ None ]	NA: size data	missing length data (33% less measuremnts than in AR)	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	Comment unclear in relation to involved MS, species etc.A discrepancy could, however, be based on the fact that within the Module III.E, also catches from surveys are included in the AR which are not included in the RDB. Germany noticed the comment for future use.	MS reply is acceptable. This issue is not relevant for MS	Satisfactory
47	RCM	2014	[ None ]	NA: size data	no length measuremnts on eel (Anguilla anguilla) in reference years 2009-2012 and no single fish weight and length measurements in RY 2009-2013	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	Germany has no eel catches in the RCM NA area, therefore no data on eel could be provided.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
48	RCM	2014	[ None ]	Baltic: age data	no data on single fish age for eel (Anguilla anguilla) in reference years 2009-2013	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	Germany is not obliged to sample single fish age data for eel in the Baltic. There are only occasional single eel in catches of German fleets. Eel from freshwater sampling, however, are being aged.	Issue to be investigated by DGMARE	Unknown
49	RCM	2014	[ None ]	Baltic: size data	no length measuremnts on salmon(Salmo salar) in reference year 2009 and no single fish weight and length measurements in RY 2009-2011	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	There is no directed commercial salmon fishery in Germany. Only two vessels have been targeting salmon on individual trips in the last years, with a few hundred individuals caught. The relevant quota corresponds to less than 10% of the Community share of the TAC (2.2%) AND the sum of relevant quotas of Member States whose allocation is less than 10% accounts for less than 25% of the Community share of the TAC (13.9%). Therefore, Germany is exempted from the estimation of the length distribution of the landings. Nevertheless, Germany sampled one vessel in 2013 which represented approximately 50% of the total German salmon landings in that year.Ä	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
50	RCM	2014	[ None ]	Baltic: age data	no data on single fish age for salmon (Salmo salar) in reference years 2009-2012	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	There is no directed commercial salmon fishery in Germany. Only two vessels have been targeting salmon on individual trips in the last years, with a few hundred individuals caught. The relevant quota corresponds to less than 10% of the Community share of the TAC (2.2%) AND the sum of relevant quotas of Member States whose allocation is less than 10% accounts for less than 25% of the Community share of the TAC (13.9%). Therefore, Germany is exempted from the estimation of the age distribution of the landings. Nevertheless, Germany sampled one vessel in 2013, which represented approximately 50% of the total German salmon landings, and collected scale samples for age determination.	MS reply is acceptable. Once the age determination will be carried out, MS should upload the collected data	Satisfactory



## GERMANY

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
363	JRC	2014	Effort		No mesh size or discards data for vessels <8m in length.	LOW	UNKNOWN	Germany is carrying out an observer programme in line with the DCF. Unlike many other countries in the Baltic Sea, we are sampling vessels <8m. The few vessels <8m that have major contributions to the total landings of cod are part of our randomized list of vessels and are rarely (though regularly) sampled. Discard information is collected and reported to WGBFAS; however, we do not specify our data by vessel length class since samples from vessels <8m are treated as those from vessels >8m. Mesh sizes are not an obligatory field in the logbooks but are documented during our observer trips. Vessels <8 m only have monthly logbook entries.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1093	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: HAWG. EcoRegion: North Sea	her-3a22: Estimation of stock identity of herring from the transfer area in Division IVa East should be improved.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	General comment not addressing Germany specifically. Germany collaborates with other MS on stock ID issues of herring in these areas.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1100	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: HAWG. EcoRegion: North Sea	her-47d3: ICES is concerned about the lack of information on unallocated removals in all herring fisheries; efforts should be made to maintain observer coverage across fleets that catch a substantial proportion of pelagic fish and to report on these issues. Introduction of the EU landing obligation may change this situation.	MEDIUM	COVERAGE	General comment not addressing Germany specifically. Germany is carrying out an observer programme within the DCF, covering the German fleet.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1108	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	her-noss: While discarding in the fisheries of this stock is considered to be low, slippage occurs. The amount of slippage is unquantified and thus cannot be accounted for in the assessment.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Germany is carrying out an observer programme covering the German fleet. Slippage events are accounted for if an observer is onboard.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1120	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	hke-nrth: Assessment data arrived after the ICES data call deadline, thus reducing time to review and audit the assessment results. Although the data were used, the delay may reduce ICES quality assurance.	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Data have been delivered before the deadline. The deadline was 10 April 2014, and the German data for northern hake have been uploaded to InterCatch on 12 March 2014. However, hake is only by-catch for Germany and is sampled if catches occur during an observed fishing trip.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1129	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	hke-nrth: Only partial discards are included in the assessment and forecast. In order to reduce uncertainty in discard estimates, an increased sampling level for on-board observer programmes is needed for some fleets (non-Nephrops trawlers, gillnetters, and longliners).	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This is a general comment not addressing Germany specifically. Hake is only minor by-catch for Germany and is sampled if catches occur during an observed fishing trip.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1138	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	hke-nrth: There is large uncertainty associated with the estimation of discards. Hake otoliths are currently collected but not used in the assessment due to lack of a validated ageing method. The utility of the current sampling and its level should be re-evaluated.	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN	This is a general comment not addressing Germany specifically. Hake is only minor by-catch for Germany and is sampled if catches occur during an observed fishing trip.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1152	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	hom-nsea: When considering the potential mixing of Western and North Sea horse mackerel in Division VIIId, better information on the biological origin of catches from that area would greatly improve the quality of future scientific advice and, consequently, management of the North Sea horse mackerel stock.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This is a general comment not addressing Germany specifically. This stock is part of the German observer programme and sampled in the frame of the DCF.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1161	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	hom-west: As in previous years, and despite the data sampling regulations for EU countries, some countries with major catches have not conducted biological sampling programmes.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This is a general comment not addressing Germany specifically. This stock is part of the German observer programme and sampled in the frame of the DCF.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1170	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	hom-west: Not all countries provide data on discards; consequently, there is no estimate of the total amount of discards in the horse mackerel fisheries.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This is a general comment not addressing Germany specifically. This stock is part of the German observer programme and sampled in the frame of the DCF. Discard data are supplied to WGWIDE if discarding occurs.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1194	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	mac-nea: Limited sampling for discards has been carried out since 2000, despite a formal requirement initiated in the EU in 2002. Estimating the discarded and slipped proportions of catch is problematic in pelagic fisheries due to high variability in discard and slipping practices. In some fleets no sampling for discards is carried out, including those fleets for which discarding is illegal. The discards included in the catch in the assessment are an underestimate.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This is a general comment not addressing Germany specifically. This stock is part of the German observer programme and sampled in the frame of the DCF. Discard data are supplied to WGWIDE if discarding occurs.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory

GERMANY										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1273	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	ple-2123: 2013 data not submitted in time to WKPLE data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Data for plaice from SD22-32 had been submitted in time before the end of the data call submission deadline. Only data from SD21 (Kattegat) had been delayed because the national data submitter responsible for this area changed in 2014.	MS answer is acceptable although MS should assure follow up on those tasks distributed between institutes.	Satisfactory
1280	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	ple-2123: No historical discard information prior to 2011 is available, but discards are considered to be significant.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Discards information back to 2008 has been uploaded to InterCatch for SD22. Before 2008, only landings were sampled and no discard estimations have been made.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1286	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	ple-2432: Information on discards is limited and indicates that discarding is substantial, but the data are insufficient to estimate a discard proportion that could be applied to give catch advice.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This is a general comment not addressing Germany specifically. The sampling coverage does not allow a reliable discard estimation for all SDs; especially in SD25, discards take place without associated landings. InterCatch does not allow extrapolation of discards to strata where no landing weight is given, thus resulting in an underestimation of the true discard. The available discard ratios show that discards are highly variable.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1389	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	tur-2232: Catch data, including discards, need to be improved to get a better understanding of the state of turbot in the Baltic Sea. Biological data would be required to distinguish stock components.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Germany is carrying out an observer programme in line with the DCF. The concurrent sampling programme of Germany is regularly sampling turbot, but usually in low abundances. In 2014, for the first time, Germany sampled two catches from gillnetters targeting turbot in SD24. This shows that we are continuously improving our sampling programme.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1501	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	cod-2532: Ageing discrepancies between countries have been recognised for a long time but the recent trend in growth rate may have increased the consequence of this problem.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This is a general comment not addressing Germany specifically. Germany (TI-OF) works intensively on solving ageing problems for this stock.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1509	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	cod-2532: Removals of cod in recreational fisheries in the Baltic Sea are currently neither consistently nor completely sampled.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	There is no recreational fisheries of cod-2532 by Germany.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1022	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	cod-347d: The Danish REX, UK northeast coast, and UK whitefish surveys have all been discontinued due to lack of funding. Such surveys require sustained support for at least five years in order for their outputs to be considered for inclusion in stock assessments as time-series indices.	MEDIUM	QUALITY	General comment not addressing Germany. This problem cannot be solved by Germany, as German catches only represent a small fraction of the total catch. Germany participates in the IBTS that is relevant for this stock and being used in the assessment.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1030	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	cod-347d: Unaccounted removals are no longer estimated for 2006 onwards. The main sources of uncertainty are aspects of the input data (historical landings and discards; discrepancies between stock trends implied by the age structure of the commercial catch and surveys) and the assumption of fishing mortality and recruitment in the advice forecast. SSB has been overestimated in previous years.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This is not a data submission problem and cannot be solved by Germany alone. The recent cod benchmark has dealt with these issues.	MS answer is acceptable. Such very general statement from the WG is very difficult to comment on in relation to a specific country. Agreed coordinated actions must be implemented through future data calls. This type of issue has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1062	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	fle-nsea: Landings data are not complete before 1998, and are probably not indicative of catches. Discards should be estimated and added to the landings.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	General comment. Germany is carrying out an observer programme in line with the DCF, where flounder catches are covered. Germany has submitted discard data for recent years to allow for catch advice. German landings data are complete.	MS answer is acceptable. Such very general statement from the WG is very difficult to comment on in relation to a specific country. Agreed coordinated actions must be implemented through future data calls. This type of issue has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1067	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	fle-nsea: The mixed TAC with dab reduces the accuracy of catch statistics per species. International sampling effort for this species is at a very low level as only the Netherlands is collecting data. An increase in sampling intensity should be considered.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	General comment. Germany is carrying out an observer programme in line with the DCF. Flounders are covered, but only occur occasionally as by-catch. The TAC problem cannot be solved by Germany alone. German discard sampling intensity allows to estimate total catch. The assessment, however, does not require age-based data.	MS answer is acceptable. Such very general statement from the WG is very difficult to comment on in relation to a specific country. Agreed coordinated actions must be implemented through future data calls. This type of issue has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1114	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCSF. EcoRegion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland	her-vian: Samples from all quarters where there is fishing activity would improve allocation of sampled mixfish in the stock-raising process. The catch was well sampled in quarters 3 and 4 in 2013; however, 6% of the catch was taken in quarter 1 and no samples were taken in this quarter.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	General comment not addressing Germany specifically. This stock only occurs in by-catches of fisheries on a mackerel and horse mackerel and is sampled (when present) during observed trips.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1218	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGMIXFISH-ADVICE. EcoRegion: North Sea	mix-fish: Mixed-fisheries analysis and projections critically rely on data being available on time to allow sufficient quality checking and preparation. Some data were submitted only shortly before the meeting, which limited the possibilities for additional data investigations.	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	The deadline was 28 March 2014, and the German data had been uploaded to InterCatch on 18 March 2014, thus in time well before the deadline.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1227	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	mur-347d: 2013 landings not submitted to 1st workgroup day	LOW	TIMELINESS	The deadline was 28 March 2014, and the German data had been uploaded to InterCatch on 18 March 2014, thus in time well before the deadline.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1244	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	nep-3-4: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	The deadline was 28 March 2014, and the German data had been uploaded to InterCatch on 18 March 2014, thus in time well before the deadline.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory

## GERMANY

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1331	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	rng-5b67: The current assessment method does not use catches from Division XIIb. Exploratory assessments were carried out using these data but are not yet considered to be reliable for advice. Fishing activity in Division XIIb currently may contribute to around 30% of the catch. The actual level of catch has been considered uncertain for several years because of problems with species reporting and misreporting to/from other areas. As this issue strongly impacts the quality of the assessment, it is necessary that substantial efforts are made to increase the monitoring of the fishery operating in Division XIIb. Countries fishing in XIIb should report reliable landings data. Countries not fishing should report 0 landings and/or 0 effort.	HIGH	QUALITY	This is a general comment not addressing Germany specifically. Germany does not fish for deep-sea species.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1339	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	rng-oth: This assessment unit consists of a number of discrete areas in which only very small catches of roundnose grenadier occur. Improvement of the advice for the stock will require regular data collection by observers on board commercial vessels. The required information must contain data on gear type, length%-age composition, maturation and feeding of the species, spatial distribution, as well as size and composition of catches, effort, and discards. This information should be presented to ICES annually.	LOW	QUALITY	This is a general comment not addressing Germany specifically. Germany does not fish for deep-sea species.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1400	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	tur-nsea: The collection of data needs to be continued in order to get a better understanding of the state of turbot stocks in the Northeast Atlantic. Priority should be given to improvement of catch-at-age information available from different countries and fleets. A fisheries independent index of abundance covering the whole stock area would improve the assessment of this stock.	HIGH	QUALITY	Germany has less than 10% of the TAC and is therefore not requested to sample age information.Â	ICES comment is too general. MS answer is acceptable.This type of issue has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1445	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	bll-nsea: Fishery-independent surveys catch very few large brill, creating data gaps for the greater fish lengths. Commercial surveys could be developed to effectively monitor the full age and size spectrum of this species.	MEDIUM	QUALITY	German catches only represent a small part of the total catches. Therefore, this problem cannot be solved by Germany alone.	MS answer is acceptable. ICES comment is too general and should not be adressed as an data transmission failure. This type of issues has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1475	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCEPH. EcoRegion: NA	Cephalopods: data not delivered in time: survey data 2013 England and Wales, Discard data Wales, ALL data from France	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	This comment is not adressing Germany (but UK & France).	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1489	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCEPH. EcoRegion: NA	Cephalopods: There is still a data clarification request process to be deployed in relation to: a) Species (even family level) identification in the catches and landings (northern countries and France) b) Discards: more biological data related to cephalopods (already being collected by some countries). c) Discard data: sampled level for discard for submission. All data should be raised.	MEDIUM	QUALITY	This is a general comment not adressing Germany specifically. Germany noticed the comment for future use. However, Germany has no fishery on cephalopods.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory

GREECE										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
342	JRC	2014	Aquaculture		Only provided data on the structure of the sector, employment in terms of number of employees, weight of sales and turnover. Therefore Greek data been excluded from most of economic and time series analysis.	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Economic data on aquaculture for 2012 were not collected, some data were collected by the DG Fisheries, Directorate of Aquaculture and transmitted to JRC.	End user does not clearly specify the reference years regarding the issue raised, however MS does not justify data transmission failure for 2012 data when National Program was implemented.	Unknown
419	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Partial data submitted only for 2012 . Impact: Incomplete time series, national analysis, EU overview and regional	HIGH	UNKNOWN	The National Program was not implemented from 2009 to 2012. Therefore economic data were not available for the period 2008-2011. The only available data was the economic variables for 2012. We have presented the corresponding data in the section of the national analysis.	Submission for DCF is mandatory for all variables and segments unless MS has a derogation. It has to be considered that Greece started to collect data in 2013 after a long period of no data collection. Hopefully the overall situation of Greek data data will improve.	Satisfactory
420	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Effort and landings data not submitted at MS and fleet segment level. Impact: Not possible to estimate any economic indicators	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Effort and landings data were not available because of not implementation of the National Program in 2012.	End user does not clearly specify the reference years regarding the issue raised. It has to be considered that Greece started to collect data in 2013 after a long period of no data collection.	Satisfactory
421	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Income from landings not submitted at MS and fleet segment level. Impact: Not possible to estimate any economic indicators	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Income from landings Å was not available because of not implementation of the National Program in 2012.	End user does not clearly specify the reference years regarding the issue raised. It has to be considered that Greece started to collect data in 2013 after a long period of no data collection.	Satisfactory
492	JRC	2014	Processing		No data provided for years 2008-2010. Total value of asset missing for 2011.	HIGH	UNKNOWN	The National Program was not implemented from 2009 to 2012. Therefore economic data were not available for the period 2008-2010.	For reference year 2008-2012 it has to be considered that Greece started to collect data in 2013 after a long period of no data collection.	Satisfactory
51	GFCM	2014	[ None ]	Task 1.2	38% completed - no data on ports and vessel number for operational units, fishing gear and vessel number for fishing periods, and no data on fishings zones and main target species 0%)	MEDIUM	COVERAGE	a) There are no available data for the base port of Greek vessels, only data for their registration port . For the overwhelming majority of the vessels these two ports are not coincided. Thus, the relevant cells have not been filled. b) Vessels number for operational units have been submitted (see sheet "Tsk1_Operational Units). c) Fishing gears and vessels number for fishing period have also been submitted (see sheet "Tsk1_OU_Fishing Periods), d) Data on fishing zones and main target species have not been submitted due to non implementation of National Program in 2012.	MS has explained that the non-implementation of the NP caused different problems, and a series of data couldnÅ™t be submitted to the different end-users. DGMARE should decide on this issue. Concerning the problems linked with the base port and the registration port (common to other Mediterranean and BS countries) this should be resolved once the new GFCM DCRF comes into force. The end user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies	Unknown
52	GFCM	2014	[ None ]	Task 1.3	17% completed - no data provided other than engine power and employment	HIGH	COVERAGE	Task 1.3 data other than engine power and employment are not available due to non implementation of National Program.	MS has explained that the non-implementation of the NP caused different problems therefore, a series of data couldnÅ™t be submitted to the different end-users. DGMARE should decide on this issue. The end user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies	Unknown
53	GFCM	2014	[ None ]	Task 1.4	All Task 1.4 data- not provided (0%)	HIGH	COVERAGE	Task 1.4 data are not available due to non implementation of National Program in 2012	MS has explained that the non-implementation of the NP caused different problems, and a series of data couldnÅ™t be submitted to the different end-users. DGMARE should decide on this issue.	Unknown
54	GFCM	2014	[ None ]	Task 1.5	All Task 1.5 data- not provided (0%)	HIGH	COVERAGE	Task 1.5 data are not available due to non implementation of National Program in 2012	MS has explained that the non-implementation of the NP caused different problems, and a series of data couldnÅ™t be submitted to the different end-users. DGMARE should decide on this issue.	Unknown
55	GFCM	2014	[ None ]	Submission deadline	all task 1 data submitted up to 1 month late (6/06/2014)	LOW	TIMELINESS	All task 1 data were submitted via e-mail sent on 4/6/2014 (i.e. two working days after the submission deadline).	The delay can be considered acceptable.Å However for the future, MS should try to submit the data respecting the established deadline.Å Should be remarked that all Task 1 data are not used by any working groups, but are only stored in the GFCM database.	Satisfactory
56	ICCAT	2014	[ None ]	T1NC: Nominal Catches	no data on small tuna species (PS fleet)	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	These data have been already submitted to ICCAT (TASK I, Å form 2)	MS answer can be acceptable assuming that MS has sent the requested data (end user should confirm it)	Unknown
468	JRC	2014	Med and BS		No data for 2009-2012; data only for last quarter in 2013	HIGH	UNKNOWN	The National Program was not implemented from 2009 to 2012. Also, administrative and financial constraints delayed the start of 2013 NP. For some species (eel, large pelagic) data has covered the whole year; for other species the coverage restricted to the second semester or the last quarter of 2013 depending on the type of fishery.	MS has explained that the non-implementation of the National Programs during the years 2009-2012 caused different problems, and a series of data couldnÅ™t be submitted to the different end-users. DGMARE should decide on this issue.	Unknown
469	JRC	2014	Med and BS		Discard data include only 2013	HIGH	UNKNOWN	The National Program was not implemented from 2009 to 2012.	MS has explained that the non-implementation of the National Programs during the years 2009-2012 caused different problems, and a series of data couldnÅ™t be submitted to the different end-users. DGMARE should decide on this issue.	Unknown
470	JRC	2014	Med and BS		Landings data before 2013 include only 6 species.	HIGH	UNKNOWN	In the June 2013 data call, 24 species (ANE, PIL, DPS, HKE, MUT, NEP, BOG, EOI, EDT, SQM, ANK, TGS, WHB, MUR, OCC, PAC, BON, CTC, SOL, SBG, SPC, HMM, HOM, SQR) have been submitted for Å the year 2013. Before 2013, the National Program was implemented on 2003(partial), 2004, 2005, 2006, 2008 (partial). In the data call, 6 species targeting for stock assessment were provided. In previous data calls, Greece had submitted landings data for all species reported.	MS has explained that the non-implementation of the National Programs during the years 2009-2012 caused different problems, and a series of data couldnÅ™t be submitted to the different end-users. DGMARE should decide on this issue. For 2013, requested data have been correctly uploaded.	Unknown
471	JRC	2014	Med and BS		Effort data and Catch data (Landings, Discards) are inconsistent: large effort values in some years-areas-gears are accompanied by very low or no catches at all	HIGH	COVERAGE	Å As the file EFFORT_MEDBS.xls was submitted, in the field "Gear" Å the value was set -1 for passive gears because the codification of gears was different in DCR and DCF. But in the field "SPECON" in the corresponding rows, the values were set to "Pass.gears"	Answer given by MS is not clear and cannot be justified. MS should specify the inconsistency of effort and catch data as requested.	Unsatisfactory
472	JRC	2014	Med and BS		MEDITS data appear complete, except during the years 2002, 2007 and 2009-2011 when the survey was not performed.	HIGH	UNKNOWN	The National Program was not implemented the years 2002, 2007 and from 2009 to 2012 therefore MEDITS survey was not performed those years.	MS has explained that the non-implementation of the National Programs during the years 2009-2012 caused different problems, and a series of data couldnÅ™t be submitted to the different end-users. DGMARE should decide on this issue.	Unknown



IRELAND										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
422	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Substantial amount of missing data at the fleet segment level for small vessel length groups (e.g. DRB VL0010, PS VL0010, TM VL0010, etc.). Impact: Incomplete coverage and times series; EU and regional analysis; unable to calculate economic indicators	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Economic data is not available for some segments in the <10m fleets. Many of these segments are low in number or change in frequency from year to year. The MS is aware of this and is making efforts to collect more data from the <10m fleets and use proxy data - based on historical records - for segments with Å missing data.	Submission for DCF is mandatory for all variables and segments unless MS has a derogation. It is positive to notice that Ireland is making efforts to improve the situation.	Unsatisfactory
423	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Effort data (fishing days and days at sea) exclude the under 10m fleet. Impact: Incomplete coverage and time series data; national level, EU overview and regional analyses affected	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Effort data for vessels <10m unavailable as these segments do not have official logbooks.	Justification is not acceptable. Effort data for vessels < 10 m should be provided even if logbooks are not available (i.e. through specific surveys)	Unsatisfactory
424	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Capital value not provided for Inactive segments. Impact: Incomplete economic, time-series and national fleet analysis	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Capital value is calculated from annual economic surveys which are sent to active vessels only. The MS will make efforts to submit Capital Value data for inactive vessels.	Capital value has to be provided also for the inactive segments. There is no acceptable explanation and justification from MS regarding failure of data delivery.	Unsatisfactory
57	ICCAT	2014	[ None ]	T1NC: Nominal Catches	no data on small tuna species (TRAW fleet)	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	Irish data submitted as specified in the data call and adequate to feed into assessment. The Irish mid water pair trawl fishery (MWTD) does not encounter small tuna species e.g. bonito within the current geographic range of the vessels involved in the fishery. If they did they would be sampled.	Issue to be investigated by DGMARE (MS states that requested data was submitted as requested, this can not be verified by EWG 15-10)	Unknown
58	ICCAT	2014	[ None ]	T2CE: Catch and Effort	questionable data quality for all gear groups	LOW	QUALITY	Irish data submitted as specified in the data call and adequate to feed into assessment.	MS answer is acceptable. Moreover, end user should provide concrete examples illustrating why data quality is considered questionable for all gear groups in order to facilitate the assessment of this issue. The end user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies	Satisfactory
59	RCM	2014	[ None ]	NA: size data	missing length data (37% less measurements than in AR)	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	The vast majority (99.8%) of the missing length data can be accounted for by Nephrops samples. These data were not submitted because the RDB fishframe format does not accommodate the majority of Nephrops sample data. This issue was highlighted at the time when the data were submitted. The problem is that the current exchange format forces samples to be assigned to either a landings or discards category while most Irish Nephrops samples are taken directly from the catch.	Issue to be investigated by DGMARE. The end user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies	Unknown
364	JRC	2014	Effort		Table B effort and Table C effort by rectangle: No information submitted for vessels <10m in length.	LOW	UNKNOWN	Effort data for vessels <10m unavailable as these segments do not have official logbooks. There is a small amount of data on effort from the Sentinel Vessel Programme but the sample size is very low. The MS is addressing this issue and has expanded it's sample size by surveying a larger sample of the <10m fleet.	The justification given by MS is not appropriate. Effort data for vessels < 10 m should be provided even if they do not fill logbooks. MS is working on this issue	Unsatisfactory
1013	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	anb-78ab: Efforts should be made to obtain reliable estimates of total catches in order to improve the assessment.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Irish discard rates for this stock are in the order of 10% and were estimated with a CV of around 35% in the last 3 years. Therefore if landings are assumed to be known without error (census data) then the catches are estimated with high precision (CV of 10% * 35% = 3.5%).	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1036	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WBGIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	anb-78ab: Accurate estimates of growth parameters are needed to facilitate the development of an analytical assessment.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Growth parameters were not requested in the data call and therefore do not constitute a non compliance. All data requested in the data call were submitted.	MS reply is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1043	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	anb-78ab: increased discarding in recent years has resulted in uncertainties in recent catch values. An increase in the discard sampling level is necessary for providing catch advice.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Ireland has annually sampled discards on between 53 and 63 trips in the last three years; this is considered sufficient to estimate the catches with high precision (<4%).	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1099	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: HAWG. EcoRegion: North Sea	her-47d3: ICES is concerned about the lack of information on unallocated removals in all herring fisheries; efforts should be made to maintain observer coverage across fleets that catch a substantial proportion of pelagic fish and to report on these issues. Introduction of the EU landing obligation may change this situation.	MEDIUM	COVERAGE	Ireland has no fishery taking North Sea herring. Ireland has an observer programme covering all its pelagic fishery with 30 observer trips undertaken in 2013.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1107	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and migratory stocks	her-noss: While discarding in the fisheries of this stock is considered to be low, slippage occurs. The amount of slippage is unquantified and thus cannot be accounted for in the assessment.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	IrelandÅ conducted 1 concurrent sea sampling trip in this fishery. There was no discarding or slipping observed during this sampling.	It is not a matter of transmission failure. Instead, it is a general concern for the quality of the assessment. Slipping pattern is not likely to be revealed by observer programs only covering a small fraction of the total number of trips as the discard pattern observed probably will not be representative for the fishery.	Unknown
1119	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and migratory stocks	hke-nrth: Assessment data arrived after the ICES data call deadline, thus reducing time to review and audit the assessment results. Although the data were used, the delay may reduce ICES quality assurance.	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	All assessment data were submitted before the deadline, a minor correction was made after the deadline.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1128	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and migratory stocks	hke-nrth: Only partial discards are included in the assessment and forecast. In order to reduce uncertainty in discard estimates, an increased sampling level for on-board observer programmes is needed for some fleets (non-Nephrops trawlers, gillnetters, and longliners).	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Discard data were submitted for gears and areas representing 99.4% of the landings.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1137	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and migratory stocks	hke-nrth: There is large uncertainty associated with the estimation of discards. Hake otoliths are currently collected but not used in the assessment due to lack of a validated ageing method. The utility of the current sampling and its level should be re-evaluated.	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN	Irish discards have been estimated with a CV of around 15% in the last 3 years. Ireland has reduced its sampling levels of hake otoliths since it became apparent that the ageing methods were not valid.	It is not a matter of transmission failure. MS collects otoliths partly according to NP, but cannot submit age data due to that no age readings are performed. The amount of otoliths collected is reduced, but still in a sufficient level to be able to support an age-based assessment.	Satisfactory

IRELAND										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1160	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	hom-west: As in previous years, and despite the data sampling regulations for EU countries, some countries with major catches have not conducted biological sampling programmes.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Ireland is not one of the countries indicated here. Ireland supplies age structured catch data to WGWIDE and almost 1500 individual fish were sampled.	End users should be more specific when defining the issue. In this case it is not relevant for the MS and therefore, the MS reply is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1169	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	hom-west: Not all countries provide data on discards; consequently, there is no estimate of the total amount of discards in the horse mackerel fisheries.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Ireland provided discard data see section 3.4 of WGWIDE report 2014	End users should be more specific when defining the issue. In this case it is not relevant for the MS and therefore, the MS reply is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1193	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	mac-nea: Limited sampling for discards has been carried out since 2000, despite a formal requirement initiated in the EU in 2002. Estimating the discarded and slipped proportions of catch is problematic in pelagic fisheries due to high variability in discard and slipping practices. In some fleets no sampling for discards is carried out, including those fleets for which discarding is illegal. The discards included in the catch in the assessment are an underestimate.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Ireland provided data see section 2.3.1 of WGWIDE report 2014	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1251	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WBGIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	anp-78ab: An increase in the discard sampling level is necessary for providing catch advice.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Ireland has annually sampled discards on between 53 and 63 trips in the last three years; this is considered sufficient to estimate the catches with high precision (<4%).	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1276	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WBGIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	anp-78ab: Accurate estimates of growth parameters are needed to facilitate the development of an analytical assessment	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Growth paramters were not requested in the data call and therefore do not constitute a non compliance. All data requested in the data call were submitted.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1450	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	boc-nea: boarfish is not currently included under the EU Data Collection Framework. A comprehensive and coordinated sampling scheme and a continuation of the targeted acoustic survey are needed to provide the scientific basis for advice on this species.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Despite the fact that boarfish is not a species required for sampling under the DCF , Ireland samples this species, and in fact is the only country to conduct an acoustic survey	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1113	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCSE. EcoRegion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland	her-vian: Samples from all quarters where there is fishing activity would improve allocation of sampled miçtlers in the stock-raising process. The catch was well sampled in quarters 3 and 4 in 2013; however, 6% of the catch was taken in quarter 1 and no samples were taken in this quarter.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Irish Sampling provided adequate data for stock assessment	MS answer is acceptable. It is acceptable that sampling schemes not always are able to reflect the actual fishing (landing) pattern even though the scheme is real time adjusted to present fishing activity.	Satisfactory
1180	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	lin-oth: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGDEEP data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Irish data was submitted into Inter catch on 28th of March, in addition, an E-mail was sent to the chairs of WGDEEP on the 28th of March with all Inter catch data and catch data by ICES rectangle	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1208	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCSE. EcoRegion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland	mgw-78: Assessment data arrived after the ICES data call deadline, thus reducing time to review and audit the assessment results.	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	All assessment data were submitted before the deadline. Revised estimates (using different stratification) were submitted after the deadline at the request of the stock coordinator.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1271	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	ory-comb: the stock recovery cannot be monitored with current monitoring data	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Data call was responded to as required with landings data submitted into inter catch before deadline. Statement refers to the lack of fisheries independent data, as there are no DCF funded deepwater surveys that cover the distribution of the stocks and could monitor potential stock recovery. Fisheries dependant data is of limited use as Orange Roughy has zero TACs and has, historically, been exploited primarily by directed fisheries.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1330	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	rng-5b67: The current assessment method does not use catches from Division XIIb. Exploratory assessments were carried out using these data but are not yet considered to be reliable for advice. Fishing activity in Division XIIb currently may contribute to around 30% of the catch. The actual level of catch has been considered uncertain for several years because of problems with species reporting and misreporting to/from other areas. As this issue strongly impacts the quality of the assessment, it is necessary that substantial efforts are made to increase the monitoring of the fishery operating in Division XIIb. Countries fishing in XIIb should report reliable landings data. Countries not fishing should report 0 landings and/or 0 effort.	HIGH	QUALITY	Ireland has no rng catches in 12b, this information was provided on 28th of March 2014 to the chairs of WGDEEP	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1373	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	arg-oth: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGDEEP data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Irish data was submitted into inter catch on 28th of March, in addition, an E-mail was sent to the chairs of WGDEEP on the 28th of March with all inter catch data and catch data by rectangle.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1396	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	bli-5b67: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGDEEP data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Irish data submitted into inter catch on 28th of March, in addition, an E-mail was sent to the chairs of WGDEEP on the 28th of March with all inter catch and catch data by ICES rectangle	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1474	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCEPH. EcoRegion: NA	Cephalopods: data not delivered in time: survey data 2013 England and Wales, Discard data Wales, ALL data from France	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Ireland not listed as country. Ireland responded to the data call as required and submitted landings, effort and survey data before the data call dead line	MS answer is acceptable. But more formally, why does a MS have to respond to this "failure" when it's not included in the list MSs having apparent failures?	Satisfactory

IRELAND										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1482	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	alf-comb: The general absence of data on species composition of the catches and biological parameters are important limiting factors for the knowledge of these fish stocks.	MEDIUM	QUALITY	There have been no Irish landings or catches of alfonosinos in 2012/2013 this information was submitted to the chairs of WGDEEP 28th of March 14. Ireland has no fishery and no sampling programme for Alfonsinos	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1488	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCEPH. EcoRegion: NA	Cephalopods: There is still a data clarification request process to be deployed in relation to: a) Species (even family level!) identification in the catches and landings (northern countries and France) b) Discards: more biological data related to cephalopods (already being collected by some countries). c) Discard data: sampled level for discard for submission. All data should be raised.	MEDIUM	QUALITY	In relation to species identification in catches and landings, Ireland can only report species codes for catches and landings at the detail provided in the log book data, one of the categories in the logbooks is squids nei. In relation to cephalopod discards, these are not measured on catch sampling trips carried out by MI Ireland. Length measurements for the landed component of the catch are recorded in order to fulfil the concurrent sampling requirement of the Data Collection Framework programme.	MS answer is acceptable. This type of issues has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1521	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	gfb-comb: Discards were provided only by Spain, French, Denmark and Sweden, although the species is discarded by more fleets. Several shelf fisheries have a bycatch of juveniles which is currently poorly estimated. Discards reported do not cover the entire distributional area of the stock	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Ireland is not required under the DCF to collect biological data for this stock because of the low volume of Irish landings in the last 5 years (<20 tons per year).	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory

ITALY										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
425	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Some effort data (fishing days, days at sea, energy consumption) missing for the distant water fleet in 2010 and 2011. Impact: Incomplete time series, national, EU overview and regional	HIGH	UNKNOWN	The file we sent on the 7th April 2014 is complete. But on JRC data base there are missing data for 2010 and energy consumption missing for 2011. We do not know if a problem in uploading process occurred, but in any case missing data refer to a very low share of total effort (please consider that more than 2300 records are requested in effort table and we just missed 4 values). In addition, data are actually collected and included in Italian DCF database, and in fact they have been sent to RCM Long distance and are included in the 2014 report	MS provided sufficient justification for complete submission with some evidents and reference, it is possible that issues could also occur from end user side.	Satisfactory
426	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Capital value missing for Inactive segments for some years . Impact: Incomplete economic, time-series and national fleet analysis	HIGH	UNKNOWN	From our checks, capital value is missing only for inactive vessels 0-6, 6-12 and 12-18 , but only for the year 2008. All other years are complete and also for 2008, inactive vessels 0-6 and 24-40 are covered. We really consider that the impact on economic analysis is very low, not significant	End user does not clearly specify the data transmission issue regarding reference years. Data submission is mandatory for all population segments unless relevant derogation is attributed. However MS justification is sufficient as issue has no impact on AER	Satisfactory
60	GFCM	2014	[ None ]	Task 1.2	40% completed -no data on ports, fishing zones and main target species and missing data for other variables	LOW	COVERAGE	This percentage of compliance is not clear. We underline the technical difficulties in providing some data in the GFCM format due to the fact that the sampling scheme, adopted for the Italian national programme, is based on the concept of mÃ©tier (fishing gear), whereas the mentioned GFCM tasks are based on the concept of operational unit (GSA - fleet segment - fishing gear class - group of species) with additional breakdown (fishing period - fishing gear - species). These discrepancies and the current structure of the GFCM Task 1 data reporting form, create several problems in reporting the requested data correctly as well as ensuring qualitative standard. On the basis of these technical difficulties, the GFCM Secretariat (in the e-mail received on the 14th of April 2015) stated that: âAs general comment to the incurred problems in submitting some of the requested information (mainly for the table âMain associated speciesâ) in compliance with the GFCM recommendation on Task 1, the Secretariat is aware of these glitches which may have prevented a Ã complete reporting by countries. The analysis of the identified data transmission issues revealed that these problems, among other aspects, were also linked to an excessive detail of data aggregation (at which the information is requested through Task 1) as well as, for the case of European countries, to the mismatch of some GFCM fleet segments with the EU metier. These difficulties, together with other important aspects, have been taken into account during the ongoing revision process of the GFCM fisheries data collection. The result of this process is the definition of the âData Collection Reference Frameworkâ (DCRF) which may be finally endorsed by the GFCM Commission at its 39th Session (25-29 May 2015)ââ.	MS answer does not explain in sufficient detail why data was lacking for ports / fishing zones / main target species. It is correct that there are several problems due to the mismatch of the DCF metier concept and the GFCM data requests at the level of operational units. Such problems have been recurring on an annual basis for several years, and will hopefully be resolved once the new GFCM DCRF comes into force. The end user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies	Unknown
61	GFCM	2014	[ None ]	Task 1.4	16% completed - no data on activity, gear units and discard values, by-catch group of species and main associated species (0%)	MEDIUM	COVERAGE	This percentage of compliance is not clear. We underline the technical difficulties in providing some data in the GFCM format due to the fact that the sampling scheme, adopted for the Italian national programme, is based on the concept of mÃ©tier (fishing gear), whereas the mentioned GFCM tasks are based on the concept of operational unit (GSA - fleet segment - fishing gear class - group of species) with additional breakdown (fishing period - fishing gear - species). These discrepancies and the current structure of the GFCM Task 1 data reporting form, create several problems in reporting the requested data correctly as well as ensuring qualitative standard. On the basis of these technical difficulties, the GFCM Secretariat (in the e-mail received on the 14th of April 2015) stated that: âAs general comment to the incurred problems in submitting some of the requested information (mainly for the table âMain associated speciesâ) in compliance with the GFCM recommendation on Task 1, the Secretariat is aware of these glitches which may have prevented a Ã complete reporting by countries. The analysis of the identified data transmission issues revealed that these problems, among other aspects, were also linked to an excessive detail of data aggregation (at which the information is requested through Task 1) as well as, for the case of European countries, to the mismatch of some GFCM fleet segments with the EU metier. These difficulties, together with other important aspects, have been taken into account during the ongoing revision process of the GFCM fisheries data collection. The result of this process is the definition of the âData Collection Reference Frameworkâ (DCRF) which may be finally endorsed by the GFCM Commission at its 39th Session (25-29 May 2015).	MS answer is mostly acceptable, although a more detailed explanation could have been provided with regards to the apparently complete lack of data on 'by-catch group of species and main associated species'. Data on discards will not be available for all operational units as requested by GFCM since discards data is only collected by the MS for metiers selected by the DCF ranking scheme, and in line with RCM Med & BS 2010 recommendations (see issue 474 for details). In addition it is correct that there are several problems due to the mismatch of the DCF metier concept and the GFCM data requests at the level of operational units. Such problems have been recurring on an annual basis for several years, and will hopefully be resolved once the new GFCM DCRF comes into force. The end user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies	Unknown

## ITALY

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
62	GFCM	2014	[ None ]	Task 1.5	28% completed - no data on sex and maturity scale (0%) and missing data on length	LOW	COVERAGE	<p>This percentage of compliance is not clear. We underline the technical difficulties in providing some data in the GFCM format due to the fact that the sampling scheme, adopted for the Italian national programme, is based on the concept of mÃ©tier (fishing gear), whereas the mentioned GFCM tasks are based on the concept of operational unit (GSA - fleet segment - fishing gear class - group of species) with additional breakdown (fishing period - fishing gear - species). These discrepancies and the current structure of the GFCM Task 1 data reporting form, create several problems in reporting the requested data correctly as well as ensuring qualitative standard. On the basis of these technical difficulties, the GFCM Secretariat (in the e-mail received on the 14th of April 2015) stated that: æAs general comment to the incurred problems in submitting some of the requested information (mainly for the table â€œMain associated speciesâ€) in compliance with the GFCM recommendation on Task 1, the Secretariat is aware of these glitches which may have prevented a Å complete reporting by countries. The analysis of the identified data transmission issues revealed that these problems, among other aspects, were also linked to an excessive detail of data aggregation (at which the information is requested through Task 1) as well as, for the case of European countries, to the mismatch of some GFCM fleet segments with the EU metier. These difficulties, together with other important aspects, have been taken into account during the ongoing revision process of the GFCM fisheries data collection. The result of this process is the definition of the â€œData Collection Reference Framework(DCRF) which may be finally endorsed by the GFCM Commission at its 39th Session (25-29 May 2015) .</p>	<p>MS answer does not explain in sufficient detail why data appears to have been lacking completely for sex / maturity scale. However it is correct that there are several problems due to the mismatch of the DCF metier concept and the GFCM data requests at the level of operational units. Such problems have been recurring on an annual basis for several years, and will hopefully be resolved once the new GFCM DCRF comes into force. The end user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies</p>	Unknown
63	ICCAT	2014	[ None ]	T2SW/CAS: Catch-at size	no data for any large and small tuna species (all fleets)	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	<p>We verified our trasmission to EU DGMARE on IT data for 2013. According to our mails, all the data have been sent toÅ Fisheries-ORP@ec.europa.eu on the 15th of May 2014.We consider this comment as not appropriate for Italy</p>	<p>Issue to be investigated by DGMARE (MS states that requested catch-at-size data was submitted as requested, this can not be verified by EWG 15-10)</p>	Unknown
64	ICCAT	2014	[ None ]	T1NC: Nominal Catches	questionable data quality for all gear groups	LOW	QUALITY	<p>The comment is too vague. Italy did not receive any feedback or quality report from ICCAT on data quality. We need more information to identify and correct the gaps in data provided</p>	<p>MS answer is justified; concrete examples illustrating why data quality is considered questionable for all Å gear groups should be provided by ICCAT to facilitate assessment of this issue. The end user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies</p>	Satisfactory
473	JRC	2014	Med and BS		In general Italian fisheries data lack the years before 2004 for the catch data, before 2003 for the effort data and before 2008 for the abundance and biomass data.	HIGH	UNKNOWN	<p>Untill 2005 data have been collected under EU Reg. 1543/00 and EU Regulation 1639/01. Under these provisions data had to be provided by fleet segments. In the subsequent programming period (under EU Reg. 199/08 and EU Decision 93/2010), data were requested also by mÃ©tier. Therefore, fishing data (catch&amp;effort) and biological data for the period 2002-2005 are only available at the level of fleet segments. This level of aggregation is not compatible with the JRC uploading formats. If required, we will provide 2002-2005 data by fleet segments in the next data call (June 2015), but this will be possible only if JRC will adapt the uploading procedures.Å Not clear what is meant by lack of abundance and biomass data. We did not find any reference to JRC coverage reports</p>	<p>It is correct that data is only being collected at metier level Å since 2005, and thus justified that for the years 2002-2005 data is only available at fleet segment level. The MS however does not explain in sufficient detail why 'this level of aggregation is not compatible with the JRC uploading formats'. The code '-1' can be entered for any information which is not applicable / not available, and it should thus be possible to submit data which is available at fleet segment level but not at metier level. Abundance and biomass data tables refer to annual scientific survey abundance / biomass by length data (excluding MEDITS), as specified in the relevant Med&amp;BS data calls. MS should clarify which surveys prior to 2008 benefited from EU funding (e.g. GRUND? acoustic surveys prior to the standardised MEDIAS surveys?), and why such data is not routinely made available for stock assessment purposes.</p>	Unsatisfactory



ITALY

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
474	JRC	2014	Med and BS		Discard data are as a rule fragmented and completely absent for years 2007-2008	HIGH	UNKNOWN	<p>In 2007 and 2008 there was no obligation to sample discards activities. Discards sampling program, were conducted on a three-annual basis. Discards data have been collected for 2003, 2006 and 2009. Thereafter, in 2010, RCMMed&amp;BS created a regional view of the discard sampling programmes (i.e. mÃ©tier important to sample for discards), in order to optimise the spatial, time and metiers coverage. Moreover, the RCMMed&amp;BS identified the key metiers important to sample for discards, providing scientific justification for not sampling certain metiers. RCMMed&amp;BS 2010 (Varna, Bulgaria 2010) reported that â€œA discards behaviour table is used to provide justification for not sampling certain metiers. This justification could be based in the discards behaviour or in the non selection of mÃ©tier in the regional ranking systemâ€ and recommends â€œto strictly following the proposed table to sample metiers for discardsâ€ (ref: Table 7, RCMED&amp;BS Report, Varna, 2010). Following this issue, not all metiers are sampled for discards and no discards data should be requested for those metiers</p>	<p>MS answer is acceptable. Triannual sampling of discards is specified for Mediterranean stocks in Appendix XII of EC 1581/2004, which was applicable at the time. To clarify re the RCMMed&amp;BS recommendations: in 2009 the Regional Coordination Meeting for the Mediterranean and Black Sea (RCM Med &amp; BS) carried out a review to determine for which of the fishing activities identified by the DCF ranking system Member States should be obliged to collect data on discards. The decisions taken were revised in the Planning Group for Methodological Development for the Mediterranean (PGMED) 2010, and endorsed by RCM Med &amp; BS 2010. According to the final RCM Med &amp; BS 2010 metiers were divided into three categories: (1) metiers for which discards should always be monitored (e.g. bottom otter trawlers), (2) metiers for which discards do not need to be monitored (e.g. demersal pots and traps), (3) metiers for which MS need to provide justifications if an exemption from discards monitoring is to be applied (e.g. set bottom longlines). For metiers in the latter category Mediterranean MS should be in a position to submit the relevant justifications (pilot studies, scientific investigations etc.) where discards data is not being collected.</p>	Unknown
475	JRC	2014	Med and BS		Effort data and Catch data (Landings, Discards) are inconsistent: large effort values in many years-areas-gears are accompanied by very low or no catches at all GSA11 - Sardinia data suffer from various inconsistencies. DCF data collected in GSA 11 has been highly problematic in the past years as widely documented in STECF EWG Med reports. During STECF EWG 14-19, the working group concluded that there will no further attempts of performing stock assessment in GSA 11 until there is a full revision of the data (catch, discards and surveys) as in current state it presents major problems and inconsistencies.	HIGH	COVERAGE	<p>We would like to consider that in the Mediterranean data call, effort values are requested for all mÃ©tiers, while catches are requested only for the species listed in the data call and only for the metiers selected by the ranking system. Therefore, the inconsistency between effort and catches for some gears is not necessary a mistake. In addition, we would like to ask to receive more detailed feedback on data quality and data coverage on Mediterranean data call.Â Regarding GSA 11, the institute in charge for this area is performing a complete revision of both landings and discards data for all years (2003-2014). An update of all files will be done for the next data call (June 2015).</p>	<p>It is correct that catch data are not requested for all species in the Med&amp;BS data call. More details / concrete examples of inconsistent catch and effort data is needed to fully assess this issue. Problems with GSA 11 data appear to have been recurring for several years; The planned revision of landings and discards data should improve the situation. MS should clarify whether the planned GSA 11 data revision for the June 2015 data call will also address the end-user concerns with GSA 11 survey data.</p>	Unknown
476	JRC	2014	Med and BS		MEDITS data appear complete with the exception of GSA 17 where the time series submitted to JRC starts in 2002 and not in 1994. This is a matter of concern that is not facilitating stock assessment of stocks in this area.	HIGH	UNKNOWN	<p>MEDITS data from GSA 17 are under the DCF National Program starting from 2002. Data from previous years do not fall in the data collection framework. We understand the scientific relevance of having data previous to 2002 and we will try to recover this information for the next data call (June 2015)</p>	<p>MS should clarify: (1) the source of funding for MEDITS surveys in 1994-2002 (including the relevant percentages covered by EU funding / Italian tax payers), (2) how the situation in GSA 17 differs from other GSAs (1994-2002 MEDITS data is available for other Italian GSAs), and (3) the reason Italy is not providing the best available data to scientists assessing GSA 17 stocks.</p>	Satisfactory



LATVIA										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
493	JRC	2014	Processing		Values reported as zero: Turnover attributed to fish processing (all years), Imputed value of unpaid labour (2010-2012)	LOW	COVERAGE	<p>The variable imputed value of unpaid labour for 2010-2012 had '0' values and was submitted to JRC in the frame of the call for data concerning the EU fish processing industry 2008-2012.</p> <p>Turnover attributed to fish processing (all years)- during the analysis period 2008-2012 about four companies had fish processing as second economic activity. Failures to deliver the requested data: Imputed value of unpaid labour was submitted. The data about turnover attributed to the fish processing are confidential and could not be submitted. Actions envisaged to avoid failures in the future: If the variable imputed value of unpaid labour will have â‚¬"0â‚¬" values it will be submitted as '0' for the future fish processing data calls. If variable will have a numeric values (in EUR) these data will be submitted to JRC.</p> <p>The data for turnover attributed to the fish processing will be submitted to JRC data base if number of companies will constitute more than 10 companies. The turnover for the four companies has a negligible share in the total processing sector turnover and does not practically affect to fish processing sector economic analysis.</p>	Comment from MS does not match the DT issue. It might be a formatting error for compiling DT issue table. For imputed value of unpaid labor could possibly be zero values which are minor in relevance and could be justified after clarification from MS, but missing turnover for all years is not justified	Unknown
65	RCM	2014	[ None ]	NS&EA: comercial landings, effort and sampling	missing data on commercial landings and commercial effort for RY 2009-2012 and missing data on commercial samplings for RY 2010	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	In NS&EA area Latvia has one fishing vessel that is targeting redfish. The import of data of this fishery into FishFrame has been started in 2013. Latvia has also accomplished the import of data for the previous years, 2009-2012. Failures to deliver the requested data: The import of data into FishFrame for redfish fishery was not made till 2013. Actions envisaged to avoid failures in the future: The import of data into FishFrame for redfish fishery has been made also for years 2009-2012.	Issue to be investigated by DGMARE (MS states that data was submitted as requested, this can not be verified by EWG)	Unknown
66	RCM	2014	[ None ]	NS&EA: age and legth data	the number of species in length samples in the RDB differed between before and after the extraction of sample records with no information from the RDB	UNKNOWN	QUALITY	The screening programme of FishFrame did not find the mistakes in the imported data and they were accepted. The check of the imported data revealed the mistakes and they were corrected. Failures to deliver the requested data: There were mistakes in the imported data. Actions envisaged to avoid failures in the future: The imported data have been checked and corrected.	Issue raised by the RCM NS&EA is unclear. It seems that problem rather lies in the RDB than on MS' side. In order to solve such detailed problems, a direct communication between RDB technical management and MS would be more appropriate.	Unknown
67	RCM	2014	[ None ]	NA: size data	no length measuremnts on eel (Anguilla anguilla) in reference years 2009-2011 and 2013 and no single fish weight and length measurements in RY 2009-2010	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	Latvia has imported eel length, weight and sex data to FishFrame data base starting from 2009. The sampling type is 'vendor'. It should be pointed out that there is no eel targeted sea fishery in Latvia and eel is caught as small by-catch. The total catch of eel in recent year was around 1-2 t therefore the sampling of eel is very difficult and the number of the sampled fish is low, however close to planned numbers in national data collection programme. Failures to deliver the requested data: There were no failures in data collection and submission. Actions envisaged to avoid failures in the future: Latvia will continue to collect eel data according to its national data collection programme.	MS reply is acceptable. This issue is not relevant for MS	Satisfactory
68	RCM	2014	[ None ]	Baltic: age data	no data on single fish age for eel (Anguilla anguilla) in reference years 2009-2013	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	Latvia has collected the otoliths of eel according to national data collection programme. Latvia has not determined the age of eel because till now we did not have necessary equipment for otolith slicing. However it should be pointed out that till now there were no requests concerning age of eel. Failures to deliver the requested data: Latvia has not determined the age of eel from the collected otoliths. Actions envisaged to avoid failures in the future: In 2014 Latvian scientist visited Polish institute where he have studied the age determination of eel. Latvia has purchased the otolith slicing equipment and is planning to start age determination of eel in the nearest future.	MS reply is not acceptable. MS should find a out a solution to process the otolith	Unsatisfactory
69	RCM	2014	[ None ]	Baltic: size data	no length measurements and single fish weight and length on salmon (Salmo salar) in reference years 2009-2010	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	Latvia has imported salmon length, weight and sex data to FishFrame data base starting from 2009. The sampling type is 'vendor'. It should be pointed out that Latvia has only small scale coastal fishery and the landings are low. Failures to deliver the requested data: There were no failures in data collection and submission. Actions envisaged to avoid failures in the future: Latvia will continue to collect salmon data according to its national data collection programme.	Issue to be investigated by DGMARE (MS states that data was submitted as requested, this can not be verified by EWG)	Unknown
70	RCM	2014	[ None ]	Baltic: age data	no data on single fish age for salmon (Salmo salar) in reference years 2009-2010	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	Latvia has collected the scales of salmon according to national data collection programme and also performed the necessary age determination. Failures to deliver the requested data: There were no failures in data collection and submission. Actions envisaged to avoid failures in the future: Latvia will continue to collect salmon data and perform the age determination according to its national data collection programme.	Issue to be investigated by DGMARE (MS states that data was submitted as requested, this can not be verified by EWG)	Unknown

LATVIA										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
365	JRC	2014	Effort		Table D, Capacity: no data for vessels <8m in length for 2003-2007.	LOW	UNKNOWN	Latvia has started to perform National data collection programme in 2005. In the first years there were failures to collect all the necessary data. Failures to deliver the requested data: There were failures to submit all the necessary data in the first years of national DCP implementation. Actions envisaged to avoid failures in the future: At present Latvia has exhaustive coverage for transversal variables including small scale fishing fleet of vessels <8m in length.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1192	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and migratory stocks	mac-nea: Limited sampling for discards has been carried out since 2000, despite a formal requirement initiated in the EU in 2002. Estimating the discarded and slipped proportions of catch is problematic in pelagic fisheries due to high variability in discard and slipping practices. In some fleets no sampling for discards is carried out, including those fleets for which discarding is illegal. The discards included in the catch in the assessment are an underestimate.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	From the widely distributed and migratory stocks Latvian fishing fleet has fished Atlantic bonito in the CECAF area. However, the sampling in CECAF area has always been very difficult. In 2013 Latvia has signed multilateral agreement with Germany, Lithuania, the Netherlands and Poland on sampling of pelagic fisheries in CECAF area. Since then the sampling is performed by local observers and Latvia covers part of the sampling expenses. Failures to deliver the requested data: The sampling of pelagic fisheries is based on multilateral agreement. Actions envisaged to avoid failures in the future : In 2015 Latvia and other involved countries will sign a new multilateral agreement.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1283	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	ple-2432: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGBFAS data call submission deadline or before workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Latvia has no fishing quota for plaice in the Baltic Sea therefore no targeted fishery is performed and all plaice is discarded. The by-catch of plaice takes place only in cod targeted fishery in Sd 25-26 and in general is on a very low level. In the observers trips in this fishery the by-catch of plaice and the biological parameters are recorded. These data are imported to FishFrame data base and are available for WGBFAS. Failures to deliver the requested data: There were no failures to submit the requested data. Actions envisaged to avoid failures in the future : Latvia strives to observe the timeliness of data submission.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1362	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: AFWG. EcoRegion: Barents Sea	smn-arct: Catch data are in most cases reported for 100% "redfish", without distinction between Sebastes mentella and S. norvegicus. Allocation of catch to beaked redfish is done a posteriori with unquantified uncertainty. Catch numbers-at-age used in the assessment rely on appropriate age sampling and reading. In 2012 and 2013 there was no age reading from the pelagic fishery, and numbers-at-age had to be derived from past age distributions and total catch numbers. Discards are believed to be low, as catch is assumed to	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Latvia has one fishing vessel which is targeting redfish. The catches are regarded as Sebastes mentella. The main fishing grounds are ICES II division and 14A sub-division. The sampling is difficult because it is too expensive to send observer on board the vessel. However, the biological parameters for redfish are collected according to the planned numbers of national DCP. Failures to deliver the requested data: Latvia is performing sampling of redfish according to national DCP. Actions envisaged to avoid failures in the future: Latvia is performing sampling of redfish according to national DCP.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1366	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: AFWG. EcoRegion: Barents Sea	smn-arct: The sample size of aged S. mentella should be increased to ensure that reliable age100%-length keys can be estimated, in particular in the Norwegian Sea.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Latvia collects the otoliths of Sebastes mentella. However, due to lack of expert in age reading of redfish the age determination is not performed. Latvia has repeatedly contacted other laboratories to make use of the collected otoliths but without success. Failures to deliver the requested data: Latvia has not delivered age data for the redfish. Actions envisaged to avoid failures in the future: Latvia has repeatedly raised the question of the use of the collected redfish otoliths. The last time was during the meeting of National correspondents on 25.03.2015. It was stated that the age reading of redfish is performed only by Norway and Iceland which are not EU countries. Besides it is stated that age reading of redfish is regarded as highly unreliable and age data are hardly used in the stock assessment. The conclusion of the discussion was to ask derogation to collect otoliths and to perform age reading because these data are not utilised.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1388	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	tur-2232: Catch data, including discards, need to be improved to get a better understanding of the state of turbot in the Baltic Sea. Biological data would be required to distinguish stock components.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	In recent years the turbot landings in Latvia have been below 10 t, that constitutes 3-4% of the total turbot landings in the Baltic Sea. The data on turbot are collected both in commercial fishery and research surveys according to National data collection programme. These data are imported to FishFrame and are available to WGBFAS. Failures to deliver the requested data: There were no failures to submit the requested data. Actions envisaged to avoid failures in the future: It is planned to prepare turbot data of the national survey for WGBFAS and to examine its usefulness for the assessment of turbot.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1407	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: NA. EcoRegion: NA	VMS data call with Helcom (Dec 2013): Latvia 100%-missing the small fleet	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	The VMS transmitter is installed on fishing vessels with length above 15 m according to existing regulation. The Latvian small fishing fleet is fishing only in the coastal zone with static fishing gears. Failures to deliver the requested data: There were no failures to submit the requested data. Actions envisaged to avoid failures in the future: VMS data are collected according to existing regulation.	VMS data are mandatory for vessels of length 15 meter and above for the years 2009-2011 and for vessels of length 12 meters and above from 2012. We note from the Latvian AR 2014 that there are 11 active vessels between 12 - 18 meters. The vessels over 15 meters already have VMS data, so it would appear that only a very small number of vessels between 12 - 15 meters are not reported.	Satisfactory
1500	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	cod-2532: Ageing discrepancies between countries have been recognised for a long time but the recent trend in growth rate may have increased the consequence of this problem.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	The age reading problem for Baltic cod has been recognised for long period. It is also considered that cod otoliths are not suitable for recognition of the age structures. Failures to deliver the requested data: It is a general problem for all Baltic states. Actions envisaged to avoid failures in the future: Latvia will continue to participate in the cod otolith exchanges and age reading workshops if such will take place.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory

LATVIA										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1508	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	cod-2532: Removals of cod in recreational fisheries in the Baltic Sea are currently neither consistently nor completely sampled.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	In recent years the distribution of Eastern Baltic cod is confined to the Sd 25 and less to Sd 26 in the southern Baltic. Due to such distribution of cod the cod recreational fishery in Latvia has not been developed since Latvian waters are outside the main distribution area of cod. Failures to deliver the requested data: Latvia has derogation to collect data on cod recreational fishery. Actions envisaged to avoid failures in the future: Latvia will perform the necessary sampling of cod recreational fishery if the cod distribution changes and recreational fishery emerges.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory



## LITHUANIA

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
431	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Only capacity data submitted for TMVL40XX (confidentiality issues). Impact: Incomplete picture of the national fleet; related to confidentiality	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Issue defined in Data transmission to end-users in 2014 regarding economic data for long distance fleet segment TMVL40XX needs to be revised by end-user which presented misleading information. Although long distance fleet segment TMVL40XX in Lithuania is close to confidentiality limits, all economic data was transmitted to JRC every year and on their basis, socioeconomic analysis of Lithuanian long distance fleet were done at STECF EWG's (could be checked in the AER reports, link particularly for 2014 <a href="http://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/documents/43805/804458/2014-11_STECF+14-16+-+AER+Fleet+economics+2014_+JRC92507.pdf">http://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/documents/43805/804458/2014-11_STECF+14-16+-+AER+Fleet+economics+2014_+JRC92507.pdf</a> page 255).	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
71	RCM	2014	[ None ]	NS&EA: comercial landings, effort and sampling	missing data on commercial samplings for RY 2009-2010	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	In 2009-2010 there no were sampling performed from commercial catches. Data were not uploaded due to absense of such. However, landings and efforts had to be there. Lithuania will re-check data in RDB	Issue to be investigated by DGMARE (MS states that data at least effort and landing date were submitted as requested, this can not be verified by EWG)	Unknown
72	RCM	2014	[ None ]	NS&EA:age and legth data	the number of species in length samples in the RDB differed between before and after the extraction of sample records with no information from the RDB	UNKNOWN	QUALITY	During the upload of data there were some technical problems: data were uploaded but data did not appear in the database. This happened several times.	Issue raised by the RCM NS&EA is unclear. It seems that problem rather lies in the RDB than on MS' side. In order to solve such detailed problems, a direct communication between RDB technical management and MS would be more appropriate.	Unknown
366	JRC	2014	Effort		Table A, catch: no data for 2003-2004.	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Lithuanian programme for collection, management and use of biological, technical, environmental, and socio-economic data has been drawn since 2005. No available data before 2005.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
367	JRC	2014	Effort		Table A, catch: no (non-zero) discards or age data for 2003-2008; discard data for cod and flounder only thereafter.	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Lithuanian programme for collection, management and use of biological, technical, environmental, and socio-economic data has been drawn since 2005. No available data before 2005. Discard data was not collected due to high refusal of vessels accept observers onboard. Scattered data of discards was insufficient for raising procedure by gears and fleet	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
368	JRC	2014	Effort		Table B, nominal effort: no data for 2000-2004.	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Lithuanian programme for collection, management and use of biological, technical, environmental, and socio-economic data has been drawn since 2005. No available data before 2005.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
369	JRC	2014	Effort		Table C, effort by rectangle: no data for 2003-2008.	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Lithuanian programme for collection, management and use of biological, technical, environmental, and socio-economic data has been drawn since 2005. No available data before 2005. Available data will be provided with Call for data Ares(2015)1506903-08/04/2015 data.	The data from 2005 to 2008 should be available	Unsatisfactory
370	JRC	2014	Effort		Table D, Capacity: no data for 2003-2008.	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Lithuanian programme for collection, management and use of biological, technical, environmental, and socio-economic data has been drawn since 2005. No available data before 2005. Available data will be provided with Call for data Ares(2015)1506903-08/04/2015 data.	The data from 2005 to 2008 should be available	Unsatisfactory
371	JRC	2014	Effort		Table E, landings by rectangle: no data for 2003-2007.	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Lithuanian programme for collection, management and use of biological, technical, environmental, and socio-economic data has been drawn since 2005. No available data before 2005. Available data will be provided with Call for data Ares(2015)1506903-08/04/2015 data.	The data from 2005 to 2008 should be available	Unsatisfactory
1050	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	fle-2628: 2013 landing and discard not submitted in time to WGBFAS data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	First upload of data (biology and landings+discards) into InterCatch was performed on March 25. During the WGBFAS meeting it was informed that effort data also has to be uploaded to IC (what was not required previously). For that reason we had to update data on April 4	MS reply is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1191	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	mac-nea: Limited sampling for discards has been carried out since 2000, despite a formal requirement initiated in the EU in 2002. Estimating the discarded and slipped proportions of catch is problematic in pelagic fisheries due to high variability in discard and slipping practices. In some fleets no sampling for discards is carried out, including those fleets for which discarding is illegal. The discards included in the catch in the assessment are an underestimate.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Lithuanian fishery on mackerel was active in 2006, 2007. During the preparation of NP for 2010 onwards catch figures of 2007-2008 were used for the planning of sampling. Sampling for mackerel was not included due to low catches in reference years and futher absence of fishery.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory

## LITHUANIA

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1361	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: AFWG. EcoRegion: Barents Sea	smn-arct: Catch data are in most cases reported for %“redfish%”, without distinction between <i>Sebastes mentella</i> and <i>S. norvegicus</i> . Allocation of catch to beaked redfish is done a posteriori with unquantified uncertainty. Catch numbers-at-age used in the assessment rely on appropriate age sampling and reading. In 2012 and 2013 there was no age reading from the pelagic fishery, and numbers-at-age had to be derived from past age distributions and total catch numbers. Discards are believed to be low, so catch is assumed to equate to landings	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Both in logbooks and observer's reports landings are declared as <i>Sebastes mentella</i> . Discards are negligible or absent at all. Otoliths has been collecting since 2013, but they are not have been read. Age reading of redfish requires special knowledge and practise. Lithuania is seeking for cooperation with other MS for task sharing in age reading. Another opportunity to solve this problem is asking for derogation for this species in updated NP for 2016.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1365	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: AFWG. EcoRegion: Barents Sea	smn-arct: The sample size of aged <i>S. mentella</i> should be increased to ensure that reliable agei%—length keys can be estimated, in particular in the Norwegian Sea.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Sampling of redfish is a new species for Lithuania and we don't have methodological manual for sampling. Quantity of samples will be reviewed in updated NP for 2016. Concerning age reading see previous comment.	MS reply is acceptable. If the MS does not have the expertise to read redfish otoliths, it is advisable to seek assistance from a MS that does.	Satisfactory
1384	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	tur-2232: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGBFAS data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	First upload of data (biology and landings+discards) into InterCatch was performed on March 25. During the WGBFAS meeting it was informed that effort data also has to be uploaded to IC (what was not required previously). For that reason we had to update data on April 4	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1387	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	tur-2232: Catch data, including discards, need to be improved to get a better understanding of the state of turbot in the Baltic Sea. Biological data would be required to distinguish stock components.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Turbot fishery is performed in coastal area using gillnets. Lithuanian turbot catches are very low (on average 10 tons annually) and discards are negligible. For that reason it was not planned to collect any biological data for turbot	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1408	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: NA. EcoRegion: NA	VMS data call with Helcom (Dec 2013): Lithuania - Only information per ICES Square, not good enough	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	The last provided data was not aggregated by request as a grid of concise spatial query and representation system of 0.05 x 0.05 degree grid due to lack of knowledge on use programme for aggregation. However, there was agreed with ICES representative to provide data VMS in longitude and latitude. NOTE: the ICES training course entitled VMS and EU Logbook Data 1stÅ ã€” 5th June 2015 was cancelled.	Lithuania should ensure that the relevant person is trained to allow upload of the data as requested. Other international colleagues with experience could be requested to provide training.	Satisfactory
1495	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	cod-2532: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGBFAS data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	First upload of data (biology and landings+discards) into InterCatch was performed on March 25. During the WGBFAS meeting it was informed that effort data also has to be uploaded to IC (what was not required previously). For that reason we had to update data on April 4	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1499	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	cod-2532: Ageing discrepancies between countries have been recognised for a long time but the recent trend in growth rate may have increased the consequence of this problem.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Age reading of cod in Lithuania has been performing by same person since 1996. If ageing discrepancies exist between countries, then regular age reading calibration exercises has to be organized	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1507	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	cod-2532: Removals of cod in recreational fisheries in the Baltic Sea are currently neither consistently nor completely sampled.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Prior 2014 data on recreational fishery has been collected using questionnaires. From 2014 manual for data collection from this type of fisheries has been issued and more efforts were put on surveys at sea. This will allow to collect more reliable data.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
1329	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and migratory stocks	rng-5b67: The current assessment method does not use catches from Division XIIb. Exploratory assessments were carried out using these data but are not yet considered to be reliable for advice. Fishing activity in Division XIIb currently may contribute to around 30% of the catch. The actual level of catch has been considered uncertain for several years because of problems with species reporting and misreporting to/from other areas. As this issue strongly impacts the quality of the assessment, it is necessary that substantial efforts are made to increase the monitoring of the fishery operating in Division XIIb. Countries fishing in XIIb should report reliable landings data. Countries not fishing should report 0 landings and/or 0 effort.	HIGH	QUALITY	Both in logbooks and observer's reports landings are declared and put to reports. All the data will be gathered the same as in other NEAFC areas.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory

## MALTA

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
432	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Some missing data at the fleet segment level in several years. Impact: Incomplete time series; not possible to calculate economic indicators for several fleet segments	HIGH	UNKNOWN	All data available at Malta's end was submitted. Pending further details on the specific segments and variables, it is assumed that the fleet segments include segments such as PS and TM. These segments consist of a small number of vessels which do not carry out fishing activities every year.Â Malta requests clarification / further details on specifically which data were missing or were inconsistent.	From data available on STECF website, it appears that there are several missing data at the level of fleet segment (just for instance, DTS 2440 year 2009, or HOK2440 years 2009 and 2010). These segments include very few vessels, therefore the issue could be related to a wrong clustering procedure. MS reply does not comment or justify these problems in data delivering	Unknown
433	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Employment data appears under reported (compared to number of vessels). Impact: Suggests incomplete data coverage	HIGH	COVERAGE	Issue has been addressed in the Fleet Economic Quality Checks, which have been uploaded. Most vessels, being small-scale and artisanal, do not employ any personnel. In most cases only the owner is working on board as unpaid labour. There could also be other family members working on board as unpaid labour.	MS answer does not explain why employment data appears under reported. It seems that a wrong interpretation of the variable employment has been given by MS. Employment should include any worker on board regardless if it is a family member, or the vessels' owner.	Unknown
434	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Questionable cost data in several years (e.g. crew costs 2009, 2010, 2011; capital costs in 2011). Impact: Unreliability of estimated economic indicators	HIGH	COVERAGE	Issue with regard to crew costs has been addressed in the Fleet Economic Quality Checks, which have been uploaded. Most vessels do not employ any personnel who are paid by the vessel. In most cases only the owner is working on board as unpaid labour. There could also be other family members working on board as unpaid labour. With respect to Capital costs, since 2013 the PIM methodology has been modified (by using digressive depreciation) in accordance with recent advice from PGECON (16th-19th April 2012, Salerno, Italy).	MS answer does not explain in sufficient detail why cost data are considered as questionable. The issue of crew cost may reflect a misinterpretation of the variable employment. Regarding capital vale, the fact that since 2013 the methodology has been modified, does not explain the problems in 2011 data.	Satisfactory
73	GFCM	2014	[ None ]	Task 1.4	68% completed - no data on discard value and by-catch group of species (0%)	LOW	COVERAGE	All data collected by Malta with regard to catch and effort variables for Task 1.4 and available in the logbooks were submitted. Reference is being made to Article 14 (4) of Council Reg. (EC) 1224/2009 which states that "Masters of Community fishing vessels shall also record intheir fishing logbook all estimated discards above 50 kg of live-weight equivalent in volume for any species." In most cases, in Malta discards of any species do not exceed 50 kg.	MS answer is acceptable. The end user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies	Unknown
74	GFCM	2014	[ None ]	Task 1.5	4% completed - missing data for all variables (1-6% completed)	HIGH	COVERAGE	Malta does not sample and provide all the biological parameters requested for all the species caught by all fleet segments; Malta collects biological data for those species collected for the DCF Regulation, which comprise the majority of the landings. The completion rate reported was calculated by dividing the rows for which data was available by the total number of rows, without giving weight to the proportion of landings of that species. Several species caught by the Maltese fleet are caught in very small amounts. The data required will change once the GFCM's Data Collection Reference Framework comes into effect.	The end user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies	Unknown
75	ICCAT	2014	[ None ]	T1NC: Nominal Catches	questionable data quality for all gear groups	LOW	QUALITY	In the T1NC form, a list of gears and gear groups was provided in a drop down list. A number of species caught by the Maltese fleet were caught using gears not represented in the provided list of gear groups. An example of such a gear was the combined gill / trammel net. To remedy this, a new code was used (TN/GILL) which was not present in the ICCAT list, and a note explaining this was added to the "notes" section. It should be mentioned that during the RCM Med&BS of 2014, it was suggested that for gears not covered by such gear groupings, a new "miscellaneous" category should be created. For nominal catches of species with no catch, the gear group "all" was used.	MS answer is acceptable. In order to facilitate the assessment of this issue, end user should provide concrete examples illustrating why data quality is considered questionable for all gear groups. The end user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies	Satisfactory
76	ICCAT	2014	[ None ]	T2CE: Catch and Effort	questionable data quality for all gear groups	LOW	QUALITY	We would be obliged if Malta were to be provided with further specifics on the problems related to the quality of catch and effort data submitted to ICCAT and for which years.	MS answer is justified. End user should provide concrete examples illustrating why data quality is considered questionable for all gear groups in order to facilitate the assessment of this issue. The end user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies	Satisfactory
77	ICCAT	2014	[ None ]	T2SW/CAS: Catch-at size	no data for swordfish from the PS fleet and for blue sharks (TW fleet) and for porbeagle (LL fleet)	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	All data available at Malta's end was submitted. The PS fleet does not target swordfish. No catches of blue shark were recorded by the TW fleet. The landing of porbeagle sharks is not permitted under the Barcelona and Bern conventions.	MS answer is acceptable. However, this issue should be investigated by DGMARE (MS states that requested data was submitted as requested, this can not be verified by EWG 15-10)	Unknown

## MALTA

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
477	JRC	2014	Med and BS	No discard data for years 2005-2008, 2013		HIGH	UNKNOWN	Commission Regulation (EC) No. 1581/2004, which covered the data collection for the period (2005 & 2008), states that data on discards is to be collected for gears for which discards represent either more than 10 % of the total catches by weight, or more than 20% of the catches in numbers for the stocks for which yearly discard data must be collected, as specified in Appendix XII. Prior to 2009 discards data were not provided in the light of the results obtained in 2005 (An assessment of the discards of the fisheries industry in Malta, 2005) which showed that there is no discard practice amongst boats smaller than 10 m and that for larger boats the discard rate is negligible (average 4.7%), Malta had also conducted a discards survey for trawlers in 2007. From the results obtained, it was noticed that only a few of the species listed in Appendix XII of Commission Regulation (EC) No. 1581/2004 are discarded in Malta, and these species represented 5 % by weight of the total annual catch. Under the mentioned regulation, therefore, collection of data on discards was therefore not required due to the discard rate being below the necessary 10 % of total catches by weight. Shortfalls in number of sampling trips at sea in 2013 were due to a temporary shortage of staff that year. Malta had taken steps to improve the situation reported in 2012. However, the staff compliment that was built up at the beginning of 2013 decreased throughout the year, which could not be addressed immediately. Despite this, several efforts have been made by Malta in 2014 to ensure that there was an improvement in meeting the planned data collection objectives as outlined in the NP &€” including collection of data on discards.Â In addition to this Malta is also working to re-establish and improve collaboration with its fishers over allowing scientists aboard. Finally, Malta points out that the majority of the Maltese fleet is composed of small vessels, many of which are too small to allow observers on board - this means that catches need to be sampled in port, whilst discards data are only obtainable through on board observations.	MS answer is acceptable. However, as stated by MS, due to the difficult to have on board observers for small scale fisheries, MS should explore the possibility to carry out self-sampling (e.g. fishers themselves could collect biological samples). Â	Satisfactory
478	JRC	2014	Med and BS	Effort data and Catch data (Landings, Discards) are inconsistent: large effort values in some years-areas-gears are accompanied by very low or no catches at all		HIGH	COVERAGE	Pending further details, it is assumed that the changes in the catch and effort values refer to the fleet segments that are < 10 m . Data for these vessels is collected through a Catch Assessment Survey, whereby the vessels <10 m are randomly sampled. The data collected is then raised in proportion with the size of the fleet. Raising the data may potentially lead to inconsistencies, since the vessels surveyed might not necessarily be representative of the rest of the fleet. Malta requests clarification / further details on specifically which data were inconsistent.	The end-user could be more specific in defininf the deficiencies	Unknown

NETHERLANDS										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
451	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Questionable data for several of the smaller vessel length groups. Impact: Questionable national time series data, EU and regional analysis	HIGH	COVERAGE	The data collection for the small scale sector in the Netherlands is done by paper questionnaires sent to all vessel owners, complemented by a telephone questionnaire on the fishing activities and telephone follow up on abnormal values in the paper questionnaire. Although the coverage of the questionnaire is reasonable, the statistical reliance of the results is low, due to high variability in the activity level of the vessels (ranging from 1 sea day to more than 200 sea days in many segments). The MS recognises this issue and is working on alternative estimating procedures for the small scale sector.	MS is aware of the low quality data for smaller vessel length groups. Comment on the high variability in the activity level of the vessels is not sufficient to justify the low quality of the results. However, MS is working on the issue.	Unsatisfactory
452	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Considerable amount of data submitted on 08/09/2014, well after the deadline	HIGH	QUALITY	During the summer of 2014 a number of quality issues became clear, resulting in the request to the AER chair to resubmit adjusted economic data. As evaluated during this period, the problem was not in the basic economic data, but in the processing/aggregation procedures. After the provision of corrected data in september. In the following months a thorough examination and quality upgrade of the aggregation procedures of the data has been carried out resulting in an adjusted dataset that has been provided in the 2015 data call on economics.	MS has to take appropriate measures to prepare and provide data in due time	Unsatisfactory
494	JRC	2014	Processing		The following economic variables were not provided: male employees and female employees for all years (the variable total employees was provided, although the delivery was not mandatory)? Extraordinary costs, net (provided for 2009, 2010 and 2012, not provided for 2008 and 2011)? subsidies (2012). No information on enterprises carrying out fish processing not as a main activity has been provided for 2008.	LOW	UNKNOWN	In the National Programme, derogation is asked for the employment by gender. Extraordinary costs, net: this variable is available by the Dutch Statistical Office, but because reasons of confidence we were not allowed to collect and use it for the analysis for the years concerned (highest value was more than 50% of the total value of the variable)? enterprises carrying out fish processing not as a main activity: this has not been collected in 2008. For all other years this information was available and has been provided.	In 2009 MS had approved derogation for employment data collection by gender, so this issue is justified. Concerning extraordinary costs, net and investments for specified years might be a zero value? therefore MS needs to clarify it. From EWG 14-07, not submission of "enterprises carrying out fish processing not as a main activity" data particularly for 2008 was justified by experts relying on comment 16. The year 2008 is not clearly covered by the DCF, as Decision 2008/949/EC (chapter IV.B.2.2) only refers to sampling in 2009, but not to the reference year: "For enterprises that carry out fish processing but not as a main activity, it is mandatory to collect the following data, in the first year of each programming period...". As mentioned, this has been accepted already and has also been stated in the reply to the Data transmission failures table for 2011.	Satisfactory
78	ICCAT	2014	[ None ]	T1FC: Fleet Characteristics	missing for TRAW fleet	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	No data call concerning small tuna species addressed to The Netherlands could be traced at this moment. The Netherlands would like to request a specification of the data call (addressed to The Netherlands) this issue refers to	MS answer could be considered acceptable assuming that the data call is not addressed to Netherlands. End user should clearly specify which data is considered missing, and if this request should be eventually addressed by Netherlands.	Unknown
79	ICCAT	2014	[ None ]	T1NC: Nominal Catches	no data on any species (sharks, large and small tunas caught as by-catch) (TRAW fleet)	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	No data call concerning small tuna species addressed to The Netherlands could be traced at this moment. The Netherlands would like to request a specification of the data call (addressed to The Netherlands) this issue refers to	MS answer could be considered acceptable assuming that the data call is not addressed to Netherlands. End user should clearly specify which data is considered missing, and if this request should be eventually addressed by Netherlands.	Unknown
80	ICCAT	2014	[ None ]	T2CE: Catch and Effort	no data on TRAW fleet (various species caught as by-catch)	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	No data call concerning small tuna species addressed to The Netherlands could be traced at this moment. The Netherlands would like to request a specification of the data call (addressed to The Netherlands) this issue refers to	MS answer could be considered acceptable assuming that the data call is not addressed to Netherlands. End user should clearly specify which data is considered missing, and if this request should be eventually addressed by Netherlands.	Unknown
81	ICCAT	2014	[ None ]	T2SW/CAS: Catch-at size	no data on small tuna species (TW fleet)	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	No data call concerning small tuna species addressed to The Netherlands could be traced at this moment. The Netherlands would like to request a specification of the data call (addressed to The Netherlands) this issue refers to.	MS answer could be considered acceptable assuming that the data call is not addressed to Netherlands. End user should clearly specify which data is considered missing, and if this request should be eventually addressed by Netherlands.	Unknown
82	RCM	2014	[ None ]	NS&EA: age and length data	the number of species in age and length samples in the RDB differed between before and after the extraction of sample records with no information from the RDB	UNKNOWN	QUALITY	For some species only length data is available, while for other both length and age data are available. Hence the difference.	Issue raised by the RCM NS&EA is unclear. It seems that problem rather lies in the RDB than on MS' side. In order to solve such detailed problems, a direct communication between RDB technical management and MS would be more appropriate.	Unknown
83	RCM	2014	[ None ]	NA: size data	missing length data (96% less measurements than in AR)	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	The majority of the Dutch fisheries takes place outside the area covered under the RCM NA. All length data relevant for the RCM NA has been uploaded to the RDB.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1012	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WBGIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	anb-78ab: Efforts should be made to obtain reliable estimates of total catches in order to improve the assessment.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	The approved Dutch National Programme does not include biological sampling programmes for catches of demersal stocks outside the North Sea, so no biological data is to be collected for this species. Catch figures originate from log books and are very low for this stock (<2t in 2013). The WG was informed again in 2014 of the irrelevance of Dutch data for this region.	The MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1035	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WBGIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	anb-78ab: Accurate estimates of growth parameters are needed to facilitate the development of an analytical assessment.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	As mentioned before, sampling of this stock is not programmed in the approved National Programme due to the non-existence of a fishery for this species. Hence, no data exist and this comment is not to be considered of relevance to The Netherlands.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory



NETHERLANDS										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1042	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	anb-78ab: increased discarding in recent years has resulted in uncertainties in recent catch values. An increase in the discard sampling level is necessary for providing catch advice.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	As mentioned before, sampling of this stock is not programmed in the approved National Programme due to the non-existence of a fishery for this species. Hence, not data exist and this comment is not to be considered of relevance to The Netherlands.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1098	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: HAWG. EcoRegion: North Sea	her-47d3: ICES is concerned about the lack of information on unallocated removals in all herring fisheries?efforts should be made to maintain observer coverage across fleets that catch a substantial proportion of pelagic fish and to report on these issues. Introduction of the EU landing obligation may change this situation.	MEDIUM	COVERAGE	This comment is a general statement, not a comment to Dutch data coverage This comment is not of relevance in this context.	MS answer is acceptable.Â Possible ways to solve the problem should be requested to the relevant RCM.	Satisfactory
1106	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	her-noss: While discarding in the fisheries of this stock is considered to be low, slippage occurs. The amount of slippage is unquantified and thus cannot be accounted for in the assessment.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This comment is a general statement, not a comment to Dutch data quality. This comment is not of relevance in this context.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1118	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	hke-nrth: Assessment data arrived after the ICES data call deadline, thus reducing time to review and audit the assessment results. Although the data were used, the delay may reduce ICES quality assurance.	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	The Netherlands acknowledges that the datadelivery was not in time for this species due to processing and upload problems. However, this was communicated with the WG and not considered a problem as long as data was delivererd prior to the WG. However, additional measures have been taken to avoid these delays in the future.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1127	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	hke-nrth: Only partial discards are included in the assessment and forecast. In order to reduce uncertainty in discard estimates, an increased sampling level for on-board observer programmes is needed for some fleets (non-Nephrops trawlers, gillnetters, and longliners).	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	The Netherlands adheres to the approved National Programme under the DCF. New sampling requirements might be taken on board as soon as the revised DCF commences and new statistically sound sampling procedures are in place to estimate sampling levels based upon end-user requirements.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1136	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	hke-nrth: There is large uncertainty associated with the estimation of discards. Hake otoliths are currently collected but not used in the assessment due to lack of a validated ageing method. The utility of the current sampling and its level should be re-evaluated.	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN	This comment is a general statement, not a comment to Dutch data quality. This comment is not of relevance in this context. The Netherlands adheres to the approved National Programme under the DCF. New sampling requirements might be taken on board as soon as the revised DCF commences and new statistically sound sampling procedures are in place to estimate sampling levels based upon end-user requirements.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1143	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	hke-nrtn: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGBIE data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	The Netherlands acknowledges that the datadelivery was not in time for this species due to processing and upload problems. However, this was communicated with the WG and not considered a problem as long as data was delivererd prior to the WG. However, additional measures have been taken to avoid these delays in the future.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1151	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	hom-nsea: When considering the potential mixing of Western and North Sea horse mackerel in Division VIId, better information on the biological origin of catches from that area would greatly improve the quality of future scientific advice and, consequently, management of the North Sea horse mackerel stock.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This comment is a general statement, not a comment to Dutch data quality. This comment is not of relevance in this context.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory

NETHERLANDS										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1159	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and migratory stocks	hom-west: As in previous years, and despite the data sampling regulations for EU countries, some countries with major catches have not conducted biological sampling programmes.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This comment is a general statement, not a comment to Dutch data quality. The Dutch data collection adheres to the approved National Programme and follows the fishery, should the fishery shift regions. All data available has been provided to the WG.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1168	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and migratory stocks	hom-west: Not all countries provide data on discards?consequently, there is no estimate of the total amount of discards in the horse mackerel fisheries.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This comment is a general statement, not a comment to Dutch data quality. The Dutch data collection adheres to the approved National Programme and follows the fishery, should the fishery shift regions. All discard data available has been provided to the WG.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1190	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and migratory stocks	mac-nea: Limited sampling for discards has been carried out since 2000, despite a formal requirement initiated in the EU in 2002. Estimating the discarded and slipped proportions of catch is problematic in pelagic fisheries due to high variability in discard and slipping practices. In some fleets no sampling for discards is carried out, including those fleets for which discarding is illegal. The discards included in the catch in the assessment are an underestimate.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This comment is a general statement, not a comment to Dutch data quality. The Dutch data collection adheres to the approved National Programme. All discard data available has been provided to the WG.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1232	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and migratory stocks	mur-west: Regular biological sampling of striped red mullet catches is expected to continue under the EU Data Collection Framework, but the frequency is currently insufficient to calculate catch-at-age outside the Bay of Biscay and Divisions VIIe?X–H.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	The Netherlands has no relevant fishery in this area, hence the comment is not relevant to The Netherlands	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1250	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	anp-78ab: An increase in the discard sampling level is necessary for providing catch advice.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	As mentioned before, sampling of this stock is not programmed in the approved National Programme due to the non-existence of a fishery for this species. Hence, not data exist and this comment is not to be considered of relevance to The Netherlands.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1275	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	anp-78ab: Accurate estimates of growth parameters are needed to facilitate the development of an analytical assessment	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	As mentioned before, sampling of this stock is not programmed in the approved National Programme due to the non-existence of a fishery for this species. Hence, not data exist and this comment is not to be considered of relevance to The Netherlands.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1298	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	anp-78ab: Reliable estimates of discards are not available	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	As mentioned before, sampling of this stock is not programmed in the approved National Programme due to the non-existence of a fishery for this species. Hence, not data exist and this comment is not to be considered of relevance to The Netherlands.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1016	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	cod-347d: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	The Netherlands acknowledges that the data delivery was not in time for this species. However, this was communicated with the WG and not considered a problem as long as data was delivered prior to the WG. However, additional measures have been taken to avoid these delays in the future.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1021	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	cod-347d: The Danish REX, UK northeast coast, and UK whitefish surveys have all been discontinued due to lack of funding. Such surveys require sustained support for at least five years in order for their outputs to be considered for inclusion in stock assessments as time-series indices.	MEDIUM	QUALITY	The Netherlands have never taken part in these surveys, so the comment is not of direct relevance to The Netherlands.	This type of issues has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory

NETHERLANDS										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1029	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	cod-347d: Unaccounted removals are no longer estimated for 2006 onwards. The main sources of uncertainty are aspects of the input data (historical landings and discards?discrepancies between stock trends implied by the age structure of the commercial catch and surveys) and the assumption of fishing mortality and recruitment in the advice forecast. SSB has been overestimated in previous years.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This comment is a general statement, not a comment to Dutch data quality. This comment is not of relevance in this context.	MS answer is acceptable. Such very general statement from the WG is very difficult to comment on in relation to a specific country. Agreed coordinated actions must be implemented through future data calls. This type of issue has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1048	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	dab-nsea: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	The Netherlands acknowledges that the datadelivery was not in time for this species. However, this was communicated with the WG and not considered a problem as long as data was delivered prior to the WG. However, additional measures have been taken to avoid these delays in the future.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1054	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	fle-nsea: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	The Netherlands acknowledges that the datadelivery was not in time for this species. However, this was communicated with the WG and not considered a problem as long as data was delivered prior to the WG. However, additional measures have been taken to avoid these delays in the future.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1061	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	fle-nsea: Landings data are not complete before 1998, and are probably not indicative of catches. Discards should be estimated and added to the landings.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Discard estimates will be delivered to the WG 2015 and the Dutch time-series of landings will be checked again for missing data. As far as The Netherlands is aware, all existing data has been delivered in earlier years.	MS answer is acceptable. Such very general statement from the WG is very difficult to comment on in relation to a specific country. Agreed coordinated actions must be implemented through future data calls. This type of issue has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1066	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	fle-nsea: The mixed TAC with dab reduces the accuracy of catch statistics per species. International sampling effort for this species is at a very low level as only the Netherlands is collecting data. An increase in sampling intensity should be considered.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	The Netherlands adheres to the approved National Programme under the DCF. New sampling requirements might be taken on board as soon as the revised DCF commences and new statistically sound sampling procedures are in place to estimate sampling sizes, based upon end-user requirements.	MS answer is acceptable. Such very general statement from the WG is very difficult to comment on in relation to a specific country. Agreed coordinated actions must be implemented through future data calls. This type of issue has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1072	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	gug-347d: Species misidentification continues to be a major problem in estimating the landings of all gurnards and hence grey gurnard. In addition, discarding is estimated to be high	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Species misidentification is not a specific problem to the Netherlands but occurs on all other countries due to incomplete reporting in log books. However, landing statistics of this species are irrelevant since most of the catch is discarded. The Netherlands is aware of this problem and when misidentified species are found during sampling, the box will be sorted again to ensure proper identification. Overall, this comment is not considered of relevance in this context.	MS answer is acceptable. Such very general statement from the WG is very difficult to comment on in relation to a specific country. Agreed coordinated actions must be implemented through future data calls. This type of issue has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1084	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	had-34/had-346a: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	The Netherlands acknowledges that the datadelivery was not in time for this species. However, this was communicated with the WG and not considered a problem as long as data was delivered prior to the WG. However, additional measures have been taken to avoid these delays in the future.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1112	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCSE. EcoRegion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland	her-vian: Samples from all quarters where there is fishing activity would improve allocation of sampled mixfish in the stock-raising process. The catch was well sampled in quarters 3 and 4 in 2013? however, 6% of the catch was taken in quarter 1 and no samples were taken in this quarter.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This comment is a general statement, not a comment to Dutch data quality. This comment is not of relevance in this context. As a general comment, The Netherlands has a seasonal fishery in the region, so year round sampling is not possible/needed.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1176	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	lem-nsea: 2013 data not submitted until workshop day WGNSSK	LOW	TIMELINESS	The Netherlands acknowledges that the datadelivery was not in time for this species due to processing and upload problems. However, this was communicated with the WG and not considered a problem as long as data was delivered prior to the WG. However, additional measures have been taken to avoid these delays in the future.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1199	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCSE. EcoRegion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland	ang-ivi: 2013 landings not submitted to 1st workgroup day	LOW	TIMELINESS	The Netherlands acknowledges that the datadelivery was not in time for this species due to processing and upload problems. However, this was communicated with the WG and not considered a problem. Additional measures have been taken to avoid these delays in the future.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1217	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGMIXFISH-ADVICE. EcoRegion: North Sea	mix-fish: Mixed-fisheries analysis and projections critically rely on data being available on time to allow sufficient quality checking and preparation. Some data were submitted only shortly before the meeting, which limited the possibilities for additional data investigations.	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	This is a general statement. The Netherlands always strives to deliver all the data required by end-users	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1223	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	mur-347d: 2013 landings and discard not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	The Netherlands acknowledges that the datadelivery was not in time for this species. However, this was communicated with the WG and not considered a problem as long as data was delivered prior to the WG. However, additional measures have been taken to avoid these delays in the future.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory

NETHERLANDS										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf_assessment
1255	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	nep-33 (FU33): Assessment data are sparse for this FU. As catches from the Danish fisheries after 2005 only account for a small proportion of the catch, lpue figures from the Danish fisheries after 2005 must be viewed cautiously as stock indicators.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This comment is a general statement, not a comment to Dutch data quality. This comment is not of relevance in this context. The Netherlands delivered all data available to the WG.	MS answer is acceptable. This is not a data transmission issue and should not have been sent out to all MS.	Satisfactory
1257	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	nep-33: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	The Netherlands acknowledges that the datadelivery was not in time for this species. This was communicated with the WG and not considered a problem as long as data was delivered prior to the WG. However, additional measures have been taken to avoid these delays in the future.	MS reply is acceptable, but every effort should be made to provide data on time.	Satisfactory
1260	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	nep-34 (FU34): No survey information is available for 2013, which makes it impossible to provide an analytical assessment for this stock at the present time.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	The Netherlands doesn't participate in this survey nor operates a fishery in this area, hence the comment is not of relevance to The Netherlands.	MS answer is acceptable. This type of issues has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1262	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	nep-34 FU34, The time-series of UWTV survey data is incomplete. Surveys were conducted in 2003, 2005, and 2009%-2012.	LOW	QUALITY	The Netherlands doesn't participate in this survey, hence the comment is not of relevance to The Netherlands.	MS answer is acceptable. This type of issues has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1264	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	nep-5: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	The Netherlands acknowledges that the datadelivery was not in time for this species. This was communicated with the WG and not considered a problem as long as data was delivered prior to the WG. However, additional measures have been taken to avoid these delays in the future.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1310	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	ple-nsea: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	The Netherlands acknowledges that the datadelivery was not in time for this species. This was communicated with the WG and not considered a problem as long as data was delivered prior to the WG. However, additional measures have been taken to avoid these delays in the future.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1377	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	arg-oth: Improvements in data sampling that would be beneficial for the current assessment include biological sampling from the EU fisheries	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	The Netherlands adheres to the approved National Programme under the DCF. New sampling requirements might be taken on board as soon as the revised DCF commences and new statistically sound sampling procedures are in place to estimate sampling sizes, based upon end-user requirements. In general, the Dutch fishery for Argentines has nearly come to a complete stop.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1378	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	sol-nsea: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	The Netherlands acknowledges that the datadelivery was not in time for this species. This was communicated with the WG and not considered a problem as long as data was delivered prior to the WG. However, additional measures have been taken to avoid these delays in the future.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1393	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	tur-kask: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	Dutch landings for this stock in 2013 were less than 0.5t, not of any relevance to this stock. Hence, the comment i not of relevance for The Netherlands	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1394	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	tur-nsea: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	The Netherlands acknowledges that the datadelivery was not in time for this species. This was communicated with the WG and not considered a problem as long as data was delivered prior to the WG. However, additional measures have been taken to avoid these delays in the future.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1399	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	tur-nsea: The collection of data needs to be continued in order to get a better understanding of the state of turbot stocks in the Northeast Atlantic. Priority should be given to improvement of catch-at-age information available from different countries and fleets. A fisheries independent index of abundance covering the whole stock area would improve the assessment of this stock.	HIGH	QUALITY	This comment is a general statement, not a comment to Dutch data quality This comment is not of relevance in this context.	ICES comment is too general. MS answer is acceptable.This type of issue has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1415	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	whg-47d: 2013 landings, discard and biol. Sampling data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	The Netherlands acknowledges that the datadelivery was not in time for this species. This was communicated with the WG and not considered a problem as long as data was delivered prior to the WG. However, additional measures have been taken to avoid these delays in the future.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1430	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	wit-nsea: 2013 landings, discard and biological sampling data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	Landings of WIT from The Netherlands sum up to 12t in total for 2013, not of direct relevance to the stock assessment. Given the spatial distribution of WIT (outside the main Dutch fishing grounds, discards of WIT are very limited and no biological sampling is programmed in the approved National Programme. The Netherlands acknowledges that the datadelivery was not in time for this species, however, the impact of Dutch data is, given the limited landings and data available, low. However, measures have been taken to avoid these delays in the future.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1439	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	bli-nsea: 2013 landing, discard and biological sampling data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	The Netherlands acknowledges that the datadelivery was not in time for this species. This was communicated with the WG and not considered a problem as long as data was delivered prior to the WG. However, additional measures have been taken to avoid these delays in the future.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory

NETHERLANDS										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1444	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	bll-nsea: Fishery-independent surveys catch very few large brill, creating data gaps for the greater fish lengths. Commercial surveys could be developed to effectively monitor the full age and size spectrum of this species.	MEDIUM	QUALITY	This comment is a general statement, not a comment to Dutch data quality This comment is not of relevance in this context.	MS answer is acceptable. ICES comment is too general and should not be adressed as an data transmission failure. This type of issues has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1473	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCEPH. EcoRegion: NA	Cephalopods: data not delivered in time: survey data 2013 England and Wales, Discard data Wales, ALL data from France	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	No directed cephalopod fishery takes places in The Netherlands. Some by-catch information was provided to the WG in time. The comment is not of relevance to The Netherlands.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1487	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCEPH. EcoRegion: NA	Cephalopods: There is still a data clarification request process to be deployed in relation to: a) Species (even family level!) identification in the catches and landings (northern countries and France) b) Discards: more biological data related to cephalopods (already being collected by some countries). c) Discard data: sampled level for discard for submission. All data should be raised.	MEDIUM	QUALITY	No directed cephalopod fishery takes places in The Netherlands. Some by-catch information was provided to the WG in time. The comment is not of relevance to The Netherlands.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory



## POLAND

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
435	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Economic data not provided for large trawlers (DTS VL40XX) due to confidentiality issues . Impact: Incomplete national, EU overview and regional coverage	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Due to small number of vessels in population (i.e. 3) economic data for deep-sea fleet, according to Polish law (statistical confidentiality), cannot be released.	Submission for DCF is mandatory for all variables and segments unless MS has a derogation. In case of very small segments for which economic data cannot be provided for confidentiality reasons, clustering should be applied. MS does not explain why clustering cannot be used to solve the issue. It could be, that clustering is not possible or makes no sense. Then MS should explain. In general, this issue arises for other MS as well. A general discussion on the European level about this issue could maybe solve this issue.	Unknown
436	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Capital value not provided for Inactive vessels. Impact: Incomplete economic, time-series and national fleet analysis	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Data were supplemented and provided in 2015 data call.	Submission for DCF is mandatory for all variables and segments unless MS has a derogation. Hopefully the submission of missing data since the AER 2015 data call will solve the issue.	Unsatisfactory
495	JRC	2014	Processing		Imputed value of unpaid labour provided only fo 2012	LOW	UNKNOWN	Poland had only started calculating the "Imputed value of unpaid labour" in 2013 (for 2012 data) because a method for estimating this variable was developed by the STECF at the end of 2011. The value of unpaid labour data for 2013 was collected and will be submitted within 2015 data call.	Poland has started to provide data on imputed value of unpaid labour for 2012. Missing values for previous years should be tried to be estimated if possible.	Satisfactory
86	RCM	2014	[ None ]	NS&EA:age and legth data	the number of species in length samples in the RDB differed between before and after the extraction of sample records with no information from the RDB	UNKNOWN	QUALITY	Not applicable to PL. The number of species in length samples in the RDB between before and after the extraction of sample records with no information from the RDB for PL match perfectly.	Issue raised by the RCM NS&EA is unclear. It seems that problem rather lies in the RDB than on MS' side. In order to solve such detailed problems, a direct communication between RDB technical management and MS would be more appropriate.	Unknown
87	RCM	2014	[ None ]	Baltic: age data	no data on single fish age for salmon (Salmo salar) in reference year 2009	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	During the data uploading process PL encountered a number of technical issues related to data formats. Data were uploaded and re-uploaded in several stages and apparently the salmon age data for 2009 were not transferred successfully. Problem was, however, identified and missing data uploaded.	Issue to be investigated by DGMARE (MS states that data was submitted as requested, this can not be verified by EWG)	Unknown
372	JRC	2014	Effort		Table A, catch: discards information for cod only for years 2004-2010.	HIGH	UNKNOWN	information on Polish cod discards estimates were reported for 2004-2013	MS and DGMARE should discuss on this issue.	Unknown
373	JRC	2014	Effort		No information on uptake of special conditions in 2011, 2012 and 2013, except in Table E, landings by rectangle.	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Information on special conditions are not available form logbooks. In table E, SPECON was determined on the basis of an "expert judgement" and the assumption that OTB >=105 mm mesh size uses BACOMA design	MS reply is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1092	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: HAWG. EcoRegion: North Sea	her-3a22: Estimation of stock identity of herring from the transfer area in Division IVa East should be improved.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Not applicable. PL does not have fishery on that stock	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1189	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	mac-nea: Limited sampling for discards has been carried out since 2000, despite a formal requirement initiated in the EU in 2002. Estimating the discarded and slipped proportions of catch is problematic in pelagic fisheries due to high variability in discard and slipping practices. In some fleets no sampling for discards is carried out, including those fleets for which discarding is illegal. The discards included in the catch in the assessment are an underestimate.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Not applicable. PL do not have fishery on that stock	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1285	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	ple-2432: Information on discards is limited and indicates that discarding is substantial, but the data are insufficient to estimate a discard proportion that could be applied to give catch advice.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	PL uploaded the plaice discards data. PL does not have plaice directed fishery (plaice is usually caught as a bycatch in flounder or cod directed fishery). PL plaice landings are marginal, not exceeding 90 MT annually	MS answer is acceptable. Such very general statement from the WG is very difficult to comment on in relation to a specific country. Agreed coordinated actions must be implemented through future data calls based on updated NPs. Polish landings in 2013 are 87 tons (not MT!!) = 16% of the total landings for that stock (SD 24-32) and 4% of landings in management area (SD 22-32).	Satisfactory
1386	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	tur-2232: Catch data, including discards, need to be improved to get a better understanding of the state of turbot in the Baltic Sea. Biological data would be required to distinguish stock components.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	PL uploaded the turbot discards data. In case of PL both landings and discards are marginal, with landings not exceeding 73 MT annually.	MS answer is acceptable. Such very general statement from the WG is very difficult to comment on in relation to a specific country. Agreed coordinated actions must be implemented through future data calls.	Satisfactory
1493	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	cod-2224: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGBFAS data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	The deadline of data call was not met by PL due to problems in generating appropriate data format from national database to that required by the data call. Therefore data sets had to be processed manually and required data were provided prior to the WG meeting. PL undertook the measures to avoid such problems in the future (by applying a dedicated software for data formats processing).	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory

POLAND

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1496	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	cod-2532: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGBFAS data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	The deadline of data call was not met by PL due to : 1. problems in generating appropriate data format from national database to that required by the data call. Therefore data sets had to be processed manually and required data were provided prior to the WG meeting; PL undertook the measures to avoid such problems in the future (by applying a dedicated software for data formats processing). 2. too short time available between the completion ofÅ BITS-1Q survey and data call deadline, having in mind thatÅ collecting the age data are time and labour consuming (in 2014 the data call deadline was unrealistic for PL).	Normal procedure in such case: If the MS isn't able to carry out age readings in due time, data should be uploaded without age information. Age information can then be uploaded later when available.	Satisfactory
1498	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	cod-2532: Ageing discrepancies between countries have been recognised for a long time but the recent trend in growth rate may have increased the consequence of this problem.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Statement is very true but the problem is not to be solved by PL alone. The age reading problem mainly refers to age interpretation, which has not been solved since 1974	General non country specific comments from assessment WGs should not be included in the issue list. Instead it should be dealt with in connection with the National Proposals and reflected in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1506	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	cod-2532: Removals of cod in recreational fisheries in the Baltic Sea are currently neither consistently nor completely sampled.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Not applicable to PL.Å Polish recreational fisheries survey was evaluated by WGRFS in 2014:Å  The recreational cod fishery in Poland is monitored using effort information (number of angling trips in sampling frames - ICES Subdivision and quarter) provided by Harbour Master Offices and mean weight of cod calculated from on-board observed trips. Raising sample mean weight of the anglers catch from observed trips in a given stratum by the known number of trips at the population level, the total recreational cod catch is obtained. WGRFS recommendations: vessel selection is not fully random and small boats (of the length of a few meters) are not covered by on-board sampling creating poten-tial bias of the total catch estimate and biological information collected, also sam-pling does not cover cod angling from the beaches, however land-based fishing methods contribute only little to the total catch. Overall, these data are of good quality, but may be biased and are likely to represent an underestimate of the total recreational catch.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1020	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	cod-347d: The Danish REX, UK northeast coast, and UK whitefish surveys have all been discontinued due to lack of funding. Such surveys require sustained support for at least five years in order for their outputs to be considered for inclusion in stock assessments as time-series indices.	MEDIUM	QUALITY	Not applicable to PL	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1028	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	cod-347d: Unaccounted removals are no longer estimated for 2006 onwards. The main sources of uncertainty are aspects of the input data (historical landings and discards; discrepancies between stock trends implied by the age structure of the commercial catch and surveys) and the assumption of fishing mortality and recruitment in the advice forecast. SSB has been overestimated in previous years.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Not applicable to PL	MS answer is acceptable. Such very general statement from the WG is very difficult to comment on in relation to a specific country. Agreed coordinated actions must be implemented through future data calls. This type of issue has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1328	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	rng-5b67: The current assessment method does not use catches from Division XIIb. Exploratory assessments were carried out using these data but are not yet considered to be reliable for advice. Fishing activity in Division XIIb currently may contribute to around 30% of the catch. The actual level of catch has been considered uncertain for several years because of problems with species reporting and misreporting to/from other areas. As this issue strongly impacts the quality of the assessment, it is necessary that substantial efforts are made to increase the monitoring of the fishery operating in Division XIIb. Countries fishing in XIIb should report reliable landings data. Countries not fishing should report 0 landings and/or 0 effort.	HIGH	QUALITY	Not applicable. PL does not have neither fishery on that stock nor fishing activity in that area	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory

PORTUGAL											
id	end-user	year	datacall		data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
437	JRC	2014	Fleet economics			Capital value not provided for inactive vessels. Impact: Incomplete economic, time-series and national fleet analysis	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Portugal sent this data on the first answer ( 3 March 2014) but when revised data was uploaded ( 5 June 2014) we sent it only for active vessels . Actually, we didn'T realise that previous data for inactive vessels would disappear.	MS justified the data failure with a technical problem in data uploading. However, it is MS's responsibility to check for data completeness before sending the data.	Unsatisfactory
438	JRC	2014	Fleet economics			Inconsistent clustering over the time period. Impact: Incomplete times series analyses	HIGH	COVERAGE	The clustering is made accordingly to the rules laid down by Reg. 2010/93/EU. The inconsistency is therefore a problem of the end user and does not constitute any issue from the sender perspective. It's not possible to provide every year a revised series for all the previous years and the needs for clustering changes with the fleet activity in each year. However, we are aware of this inconsistencies and a revised historical data is expected in the near future.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
496	JRC	2014	Processing			Non-submission of data on depreciation of capital (all years) and extraordinary costs, net (2010).	LOW	UNKNOWN	PRT uses SBS data to answer the datacall. Depreciation of capital is not a collected variable and estimation is not possible unless there is a parallel data collection by the DGRM to collect this values. This is against the statistical recommendations for double collection of data and the reliability of the indicator is questionable, as the national statistical authorities don't made the frame population available to other users. As for the extraordinary costs, they disappear from the national account system and are distributed into other costs. The variable should be deprecated or made optional as it's not possible to collect it. This issue was explained in several STECF meetings.	Insufficient justification for missing data on depreciation of capital. If MS has a reasonable explanation for exclusion of particular variable from data collection, should be asked for derogation in NP. Extraordinary costs, net are missing only for 2010 and not for following years according the end-user comment, so this particular issue seems to be solved. The depreciation issue is still valid.	Unsatisfactory
88	GFCM	2014	[ None ]	Task 1.2		69% completed - no data on ports, fishing zones and main target species (0%)	LOW	COVERAGE	There are only 2 portuguese vessel operating in the mediterranean area. Therefore, the fleet segment should be clustered or the data should be kept confidential. Being the only fleet segment on this region, clustering means that the fleet segment will be included in another with a different supra_region. In either case, it's not possible to provide the data, for confidential reasons. In an effort to overcome this situation and on a voluntary basis, PRT is asking the vessel owners for permission to publish the aggregated data for the 2 vessels. If we achieve the consent of both owners, we will submit the data.	MS covered 60% of Task 1,2 and it can considered acceptable. The end user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies	Unknown
89	GFCM	2014	[ None ]	Task 1.3		18% completed - no data provided other than engine power and landing weight	HIGH	COVERAGE	There are only 2 portuguese vessel operating in the mediterranean area. Therefore, the fleet segment should be clustered or the data should be kept confidential. Neing the only fleet segment on this region, clustering means that the fleet segment will be included in another with a different supra_region. In either case, it's not possible to provide the data, for confidential reasons. In an effort to overcome this situation and on a voluntary basis, PRT is asking the vessel owners for permission to publish the aggregated data for the 2 vessels. If we achieve the consent of both owners, we will submit the data.	The explanation given by MS is not acceptable. Requested data should be submitted (i.e. following the requested aggregation, stratification etc.), in agreement with the GFCM Recommendation as also endorsed by EU regulation (EU Reg. 1343/2011). There is no any problem related to the confidentiality of the data. Moreover, these data are not disclosed to an external public following the GFCM resolution 35/2011/2. The end user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies	Unknown
90	GFCM	2014	[ None ]	Task 1.4		53% completed - no data on discard and by-catch value, group by-catch species, by-catch weight and number and CPUE value	LOW	COVERAGE	Portugal has only two vessels operating in the Mediterranean area. The current data collection programme doesn't cover this area and, therefore, there's no biological data being collected.	MS answer can be considered acceptable. However, at least data on landing and effort should be reported at Regional level in order to analyse the impact of this fishing activity. The end user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies	Unknown
91	GFCM	2014	[ None ]	Task 1.5		All Task 1.5 data- not provided (0%)	HIGH	COVERAGE	There are only 2 portuguese vessel operating in the mediterranean area. Therefore, the fleet segment should be clustered or the data should be kept confidential. Being the only fleet segment on this region, clustering means that the fleet segment will be included in another with a different supra_region. In either case, it's not possible to provide the data, for confidential reasons. In an effort to overcome this situation and on a voluntary basis, PRT is asking the vessel owners for permission to publish the aggregated data for the 2 vessels. If we achieve the consent of both owners, we will submit the data.	The explanation given by MS is not acceptable. Data (e.g. length data, average length, maturity scale etc.) for Task 1.5 should be given aggregated per species and gear . There's no any problem related to the confidentiality of the data. Data should be submitted (i.e. following the requested aggregation, stratification etc.) in agreement with the GFCM Recommendation as also endorsed by EU regulation (EU Reg. 1343/2011). Moreover, these data are not disclosed to an external public following the GFCM resolution 35/2011/2.	Unsatisfactory
92	ICCAT	2014	[ None ]	T1FC: Fleet Characteristics		questionable data quality for the Azores fleets: BB and LL	LOW	QUALITY	In 2014 the SCRS (Scientific Committee from ICCAT) decided to test new criteria to data submitted. The conformity to the new criteria were applied as a test and will be effectively used in 2015. The information submitted would be full acted if the previous criteria were used. Please see the details in the 2014 SCRS report ( Appendix 8, page 302) (link: http://www.iccat.int/Documents/BienRep/REP_EN_14-15_I-1.pdf). In Annex 8: "3.2 Application of Filters 1 and 2 on data submission: The Sub-Committee reiterated their support for their future use, and considers that they should be fully applied (both filters) in a period of two years (being the next year an additional testing year for filter 2)."	Assuming that MS is following the agreement reached by the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics (SCRS), answer can be justified. However, MS should correctly detail in which part of the mentioned report (International Commission for the Conservation of Tunas Report for biennial period, 2014-15 Part 1 - Vol. 1) are mentioned these new criteria and the testing phase.	Unknown

PORTUGAL											
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf	assessment
93	ICCAT	2014	[ None ]	T1NC: Nominal Catches	questionable data quality for the Azores and Madeira fleets for all gear groups	LOW	QUALITY	In 2014 the SCRS (Scientific Committee from ICCAT) decided to test new criteria to data submitted. The conformity to the new criteria were applied as a test and will be effectively used in 2015. The information submitted would be full acted if the previous criteria were used. Please see the details in the 2014 SCRS report ( Appendix 8, page 302) (link: <a href="http://www.iccat.int/Documents/BienRep/REP_EN_14-15_I-1.pdf">http://www.iccat.int/Documents/BienRep/REP_EN_14-15_I-1.pdf</a> ). In Annex 8: "3.2 Application of Filters 1 and 2 on data submission: The Sub-Committee reiterated their support for their future use, and considers that they should be fully applied (both filters) in a period of two years (being the next year an additional testing year for filter 2)."	Assuming that MS is following the agreement reached by the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics (SCRS), answer can be justified. However, MS should correctly detail in which part of the mentioned report (International Commission for the Conservation of Tunas Report for biennial period, 2014-15 Part 1 - Vol. 1) are mentioned these new criteria and the testing phase.	Unknown	
94	ICCAT	2014	[ None ]	T2CE: Catch and Effort	questionable data quality for the Azores and Madeira fleets for all gear groups	LOW	QUALITY	In 2014 the SCRS (Scientific Committee from ICCAT) decided to test new criteria to data submitted. The conformity to the new criteria were applied as a test and will be effectively used in 2015. The information submitted would be full acted if the previous criteria were used. Please see the details in the 2014 SCRS report ( Appendix 8, page 302) (link: <a href="http://www.iccat.int/Documents/BienRep/REP_EN_14-15_I-1.pdf">http://www.iccat.int/Documents/BienRep/REP_EN_14-15_I-1.pdf</a> ). In Annex 8: "3.2 Application of Filters 1 and 2 on data submission: The Sub-Committee reiterated their support for their future use, and considers that they should be fully applied (both filters) in a period of two years (being the next year an additional testing year for filter 2)."	Assuming that MS is following the agreement reached by the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics (SCRS), answer can be justified. However, MS should correctly detail in which part of the mentioned report (International Commission for the Conservation of Tunas Report for biennial period, 2014-15 Part 1 - Vol. 1) are mentioned these new criteria and the testing phase.	Unknown	
95	ICCAT	2014	[ None ]	T2SW/CAS: Catch-at size	no data on large tuna species (BB fleet)	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	In 2014 the SCRS (Scientific Committee from ICCAT) decided to test new criteria to data submitted. The conformity to the new criteria were applied as a test and will be effectively used in 2015. The information submitted would be full acted if the previous criteria were used. Please see the details in the 2014 SCRS report ( Appendix 8, page 302) (link: <a href="http://www.iccat.int/Documents/BienRep/REP_EN_14-15_I-1.pdf">http://www.iccat.int/Documents/BienRep/REP_EN_14-15_I-1.pdf</a> ). In Annex 8: "3.2 Application of Filters 1 and 2 on data submission: The Sub-Committee reiterated their support for their future use, and considers that they should be fully applied (both filters) in a period of two years (being the next year an additional testing year for filter 2)."	Assuming that MS is following the agreement reached by the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics (SCRS), answer can be justified. However, MS should correctly detail in which part of the mentioned report (International Commission for the Conservation of Tunas Report for biennial period, 2014-15 Part 1 - Vol. 1) are mentioned these new criteria and the testing phase.	Unknown	
96	RCM	2014	[ None ]	NS&EA: comercial landings, effort and sampling	missing data on commercial landing for RY 2009-2011 and for commercial samplings for RY 2009-2013	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	There is no missing data. Some areas in NEAFC are not included in RDBFF lookup tables (e.g., 27.IIb). Commercial sampling data on trips registering hauls in these areas couldn't be uploaded. Furthermore, Portugal produced a report on the difficulties experienced at IPMA when uploading data to RDBFF (Fishframe 5.0) in response to the RCM NA and RCM NS&EA 2014 data call.	The areas included in RDBFF should be updated in order cope with all relevant areas.	Satisfactory	
97	WCPFC	2014	[ None ]	CMM 2011-04 para 03	no data on catches, releases and status upon release of oceanic white tip sharks for longliners	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	Portugal has a single longline vessel fishing on the WCPFC convention area. In fact, the majority of the longline fleet is operating in the Atlantic Ocean and to a much lower level at the Indian Ocean. Moreover, that single vessel makes large trips of up to 4 month and do not land in Portuguese ports. Therefore, the current data collection programme ongoing at IPMA is unable to collect any fisheries data, neither gear specifications. However, an effort will be made during 2015 to overcome these difficulties that have precluded the submission of the requested data, by implementing a self-reporting system, which has already been in place at the Atlantic and Indian Oceans.	MS answer clearly stated that no data have been collected, and thereafter submitted, in 2014. Commission should judge in relation of this problem (no data submitted). MS will try to overcome this problem in 2015 and the proposed approach (e.g. self-reporting) is welcome.	Unknown	
98	WCPFC	2014	[ None ]	CMM 2007-01 Attachment K Annex C06	no data for longliners ( minimum of 5% is required)	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	Portugal has a single longline vessel fishing on the WCPFC convention area. In fact, the majority of the longline fleet is operating in the Atlantic Ocean and to a much lower level at the Indian Ocean. Moreover, that single vessel makes large trips of up to 4 month and do not land in Portuguese ports. Therefore, the current data collection programme ongoing at IPMA is unable to collect any fisheries data, neither gear specifications. However, an effort will be made during 2015 to overcome these difficulties that have precluded the submission of the requested data, by implementing a self-reporting system, which has already been in place at the Atlantic and Indian Oceans.	MS answer clearly stated that no data have been collected, and thereafter submitted, in 2014. Commission should judge in relation of this problem (no data submitted). MS will try to overcome this problem in 2015 and the proposed approach (e.g. self-reporting) is welcome.	Unknown	
99	WCPFC	2014	[ None ]	SciData 03	missing operational data for longliners on branchlines between floats, discards information, data related to key shark species, number of fish caught (fundamental requirement for stock assessments in the WCPFC), and time of set	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	Portugal has a single longline vessel fishing on the WCPFC convention area. In fact, the majority of the longline fleet is operating in the Atlantic Ocean and to a much lower level at the Indian Ocean. Moreover, that single vessel makes large trips of up to 4 month and do not land in Portuguese ports. Therefore, the current data collection programme ongoing at IPMA is unable to collect any fisheries data, neither gear specifications. However, an effort will be made during 2015 to overcome these difficulties that have precluded the submission of the requested data, by implementing a self-reporting system, which has already been in place at the Atlantic and Indian Oceans.	MS answer clearly stated that no data have been collected, and thereafter submitted, in 2014. Commission should judge in relation of this problem (no data submitted). MS will try to overcome this problem in 2015 and the proposed approach (e.g. self-reporting) is welcome.	Unknown	

PORTUGAL										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
100	WCPFC	2014	[ None ]	SciData 05	no size data provided for longliners	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	Portugal has a single longline vessel fishing on the WPCFC convention area. In fact, the majority of the longline fleet is operating in the Atlantic Ocean and to a much lower level at the Indian Ocean. Moreover, that single vessel makes large trips of up to 4 month and do not land in Portuguese ports. Therefore, the current data collection programme ongoing at IPMA is unable to collect any fisheries data, neither gear specifications. However, an effort will be made during 2015 to overcome these difficulties that have precluded the submission of the requested data, by implementing a self-reporting system, which has already been in place at the Atlantic and Indian Oceans.	MS answer clearly stated that no data have been collected, and thereafter submitted, in 2014. Commission should judge in relation of this problem (no data submitted). MS will try to overcome this problem in 2015 and the proposed approach (e.g. self-reporting) is welcome.	Unknown
101	RCM	2014	[ None ]	NA: size data	failure to upload length data although in AR	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	There is no failure on length upload. In Portuguese fisheries there is a vast array of species (>200 taxa) recorded, including many invertebrates. Many of these species are not present in the RDBFF lookup-table and so cannot be uploaded. Length data were uploaded only the species and stocks defined in the DCF and within RDBFF lookupables. The relevant RCMs were informed of this issue. Furthermore, Portugal produced a report on the difficulties experienced at IPMA when uploading data to RDBFF (Fishframe 5.0) in response to the RCM NA and RCM NS&EA 2014 data call.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
102	RCM	2014	[ None ]	NA: areas	data from trips with no haul not uploaded	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	There is no missing data. When no haul is performed in a trip there is no "Station number", date, time or other haul characteristics, which currently is not acceptable by RDBFF. Data were uploaded. However, data from trips with no haul were not uploaded. The relevant RCMs were informed of this issue. Furthermore, Portugal produced a report on the difficulties experienced at IPMA when uploading data to RDBFF (Fishframe 5.0) in response to the RCM NA and RCM NS&EA 2014 data call.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
103	RCM	2014	[ None ]	NA: areas	data on trips registering hauls in NEAFC-areas not included in the look up table not uploaded	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	There is no missing data. Some areas in NEAFC are not included in RDBFF lookup tables (e.g., 27.11b). Complete data on trips registering hauls in these areas couldn't be uploaded. Furthermore, Portugal produced a report on the difficulties experienced at IPMA when uploading data to RDBFF (Fishframe 5.0) in response to the RCM NA and RCM NS&EA 2014 data call.	MS answer is acceptable. RDBFF administrators should add the missing areas to the database.	Satisfactory
374	JRC	2014	Effort		Gear information missing for vessels < 10m not using longline. Table A, catch: age data provided for black scabbard fish only.	HIGH	UNKNOWN	The polyvalent nature of small scale fisheries make it impossible to disaggregate catches by-gear with the resolution level required by this data call. We note that the missing gear is not the predominant gear of the vessel as defined by DCF regulation but the actual gear used by the vessel for each catch. We also note that the disaggregation level requested by the data call is not in compliance with DCF regulation. Therefore we consider that the data call was fully answered. A	MS reply is partially acceptable. No justification is given for the missing data in table A, catch	Unknown
375	JRC	2014	Effort		Re-submission of data less than one week before second EWG.	HIGH	QUALITY	Some issues were detected and a resubmission was needed, although not desired. MS will have it easier if the specifications of this datacall don't change year after year.	MS has to take appropriate measures to prepare and provide data in due time	Unsatisfactory
1082	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	anb-8c9a: The lack of a validated age-reading criterion precludes the use of assessment models based on age data. Due to the broad size range of the species, length sampling should be increased to ensure adequate data for future development of improved assessment methods.	MEDIUM	QUALITY	Lack of a validated age issue: No catch numbers-at-age are provided to the Working Group. At the WGHMM 2007 meeting, age&length keys, based on illicia readings, were used to obtain catch number-at-age for each species. The exploratory analysis of estimates indicated that the biased age reading criterion does not allow following cohorts along years in either of the two anglerfish species. The last research about white anglerfish ageing, White Anglerfish Illicia and Otoliths Exchange 2011 (ICES, 2012b), highlighted that neither illicia nor otolith age readings have been validated and, in the case of illicia studies, the agreement among readers and the precision were not acceptable. Therefore it was concluded that the available age reading criteria for white anglerfish southern stock is not valid to build an ALK. Length sampling issue: For species like the anglerfishes, where the vast majority of vessels land few amounts, species misassignment makes it particularly difficult to obtain good proportions and length frequencies at trip level, greatly limiting the accuracy and precision of final length composition estimates. From 2009 onwards the design has been focused on m&lt;tiers conforming DCF requirements (Commission Decision No. 2010/93/UE). Following preparatory discussions on probability-based sampling, IPMA is already working to design a pilot market sampling plan to overcome this issue and to be implemented in 2016. The goal of this sampling plan is therefore to improve the quality of data sent for ICES stock assessments and the overall quality of fisheries data, including blackbellyed angler and anglerfish.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory



PORTUGAL										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1089	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGHANSA. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	ane-pore: Although discards in anchovy fisheries is generally thought to be negligible, there is insufficient information to confirm this.	MEDIUM	QUALITY	Analysis on the volume (metric tonnes) of WGHANSA species discarded in the Portuguese OTB fishery (2004-2013) indicate low frequency of occurrence of anchovy . The low frequency of occurrence and the low number of specimens registered indicates that anchovy discards are negligible for assessment purposes. Thus, discards were not estimated (Prista et al., 2014. Working Document for the ICES Working Group on Southern Horse Mackerel, Anchovy and Sardine, ICES HQ, Copenhagen, Denmark, 20-24 June 2014). However, recognizing that absence of negligible discard values from Intercatch maybe perceived as missing data, in 2015 Portugal will update Intercatch with zero values in the years when discards were null or negligible.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1147	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	hke-soth: Hake otoliths are currently collected but not used in the assessment due to lack of a validated ageing method. The utility of the current sampling and its level should be re-evaluated.	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN	Collection of otoliths for ageing is under re-evaluation. Otoliths will continue to be collected from the specimens sampled for maturation throughout 2015 and possibly 2016, after which the biological sampling will be determined from the needs of maturity samples and not otolith collection.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1149	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	hke-soth: The P-TR lpue series has not been updated since 2011. The SP-CORUTR lpue series was not updated in 2013. These lpue series, used to calibrate the model, are the main source of information trends for large fish. The influence of this lack of update on the quality of the assessment has not been evaluated.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	The lpue series will be updated in 2015, at least to 2013. As referred in WGBIE report 2014, effort and respective landings series are collected from Portuguese log-books maintained in DGRM and compiled by IPMA. For the Portuguese fleets, until 2011 most log-books were filled in paper but have thereafter been progressively replaced by elogbooks. In 2013 more than 90% of the log-books are being completed in the electronic version. However, due to various errors, data cleaning algorithms are required and are yet to be agreed upon internally. IPMA therefore opted to postpone estimations of CPUE until 2015 (at which time the series will also be revised backwards).	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1173	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGHANSA. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	jaa-10: For 2013, discard data were not collected and an estimate was used based on historic information.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Due to lack of funds the discards observer programme in area X during 2013 was not conducted. It was only possible to perform a estimation taking in consideration the discards time series from the last 9 years of observer programme. PRT is aware of the decreasing quality of the data and will try to overtake this situation as soon as possible.	The MS does not apply to the NP where 150 trips were suppose to be sampled in 2013.	Unsatisfactory
1202	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	mgb-8c9a: 2013 landings and biological sampling data not submitted in time to WGBIE data call submission deadline, but until workshop day. No discard submitted.	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Data submission issue: Data submitted in time. Data have been validated and loaded into InterCatch database 10 April 2014, 19:54:12 (Data log screen available). Discards issue: The low frequency of occurrence and the low number of specimens registered indicates that mgb discards are negligible for assessment purposes (Working Document for the ICES Working Group for the Bay of Biscay and Iberian Waters Ecoregion, 7-13 May, 2014). Thus discards estimation were not provided. However, recognizing that absence of negligible Lepidorhombus boscii discard values from Intercatch maybe perceived as missing data, Portugal has recently updated Intercatch with zero values for Lepidorhombus boscii discards in the period 2012-2014.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1204	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	mgb-8c9a: Assessment data arrived after the ICES data call deadline, thus reducing time to review and audit the assessment results. Although the data were used, the delay may reduce ICES quality assurance	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Data submission issue: Data submitted in time. Data have been validated and loaded into InterCatch database 10 April 2014, 19:54:12.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1212	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland	mgw-8c9a: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGBIE data call submission deadline, but until workshop day. Discard missing in InterCatch	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Data submission issue: Data submitted in time. Data have been validated and loaded into InterCatch database 10 April 2014, 20:31:47 (Data log screen available). Discards issue: The low frequency of occurrence and the low number of specimens registered indicates that mgw discards are negligible for assessment purposes (Working Document for the ICES Working Group for the Bay of Biscay and Iberian Waters Ecoregion, 7-13 May, 2014). Thus discards estimation were not provided. However, recognizing that absence of negligible Lepidorhombus whiffiagonis discard values from Intercatch maybe perceived as missing data, Portugal has recently updated Intercatch with zero values for Lepidorhombus whiffiagonis discards in the period 2012-2014.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory

PORTUGAL										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1214	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	mgw-8c9a: Assessment data arrived after the ICES data call deadline, thus reducing time to review and audit the assessment results. Although the data were used, the delay may reduce ICES quality assurance.	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Data submission issue: Data submitted in time. Data have been validated and loaded into InterCatch database 10 April 2014, 20:31:47 (Data log screen available).	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1231	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and migratory stocks	mur-west: Regular biological sampling of striped red mullet catches is expected to continue under the EU Data Collection Framework, but the frequency is currently insufficient to calculate catch-at-age outside the Bay of Biscay and Divisions VIIeIX–h.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Regular biological sampling issue: Portugal doesn't collect biological parameters on striped red mullet catches. Since 2009, a concurrent sampling design is carried out and length compositions has been provided since then.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1294	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	ple-89a: There are concerns about the reliability of the 2008IX–2009 French data. Landings statistics need to be quality assured and confirmed for the region, and associated effort should be compiled.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	These data doesn't concern Portugal	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1316	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	pol-89a: Data on growth, maturity, and discards from the fisheries are needed.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Data need issue: Portugal doesn't collect biological parameters on pollock. Portuguese official landings are very low. Since 2009, a concurrent sampling design is carried out and length compositions has been provided since then. Discards of pollock are null. In 2015 Portugal updated Inter catch with zero values in the years when discards were null or negligible.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1320	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	pol-89a: Recreational catches of pollack may be substantial but are not quantified.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	There is no obligation to collect recreational fisheries on this specie. The affirmation appear to be of subjective nature. If the expert group wants this species included in the next regulation, it should follow the appropriate channels.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1360	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: AFWG. EcoRegion: Barents Sea	smn-arct: Catch data are in most cases reported for IX"redfishIX", without distinction between Sebastes mentella and S. norvegicus. Allocation of catch to beaked redfish is done a posteriori with unquantified uncertainty. Catch numbers-at-age used in the assessment rely on appropriate age sampling and reading. In 2012 and 2013 there was no age reading from the pelagic fishery, and numbers-at-age had to be derived from past age distributions and total catch numbers. Discards are believed to be low, so catch is assumed to equate to landings	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Catch data and age issue: The Portuguese sampling in Eastern Arctic fishing ground is performed onboard by a nurse man, member of the crew of the collaborative fishing vessels. In 2014, as in previous years, no length compositions or stock-related variables were collected for Sebastes mentella. Gadus morhua was the primary target of the Portuguese collaborative fleet operating in the Eastern Arctic areas and the amounts of S. mentella bycatch were minimal, making the collection of individuals for sampling a (very) difficult task to perform within the time frame of fish processing once the haul is on deck.	MS answer is satisfactory, however the MS should look into what possibilities are available to provide the data in the future.	Satisfactory
1364	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: AFWG. EcoRegion: Barents Sea	smn-arct: The sample size of aged S. mentella should be increased to ensure that reliable ageIX–length keys can be estimated, in particular in the Norwegian Sea.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	The Portuguese sampling in Eastern Arctic fishing ground is performed onboard by a nurse man, member of the crew of the collaborative fishing vessels. In 2014, as in previous years, no length compositions or stock-related variables were collected for Sebastes mentella. Gadus morhua was the primary target of the Portuguese collaborative fleet operating in the Eastern Arctic areas and the amounts of S. mentella bycatch were minimal, making the collection of individuals for sampling a (very) difficult task to perform within the time frame of fish processing once the haul is on deck.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1368	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	sol-8c9a: Assessment data arrived after the ICES data call deadline, thus reducing time to review and audit the assessment results. Although the data were used, the delay may reduce ICES quality assurance.	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	No data call issued for sol-8c9a in 2014. No assessment for this stock. Working Document presented at the WGBIE by IPMA with landings and length composition estimated by fisheries.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1372	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	sol-8c9a: There is strong evidence of species misidentification in the landings statistics regarding sole species in this area: Solea solea, Solea senegalensis, and Pegusa lascaris. The Spanish reported landings are already corrected to correspond only to Solea solea.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Species misidentification is a problem through all MS and organizations. Recently there was a discussion about the theme at the fisheries statistics working group, at Eurostat. There are no clear road to understand when a species is being misidentified, as their habitats can overlap. PRT has been correcting many of the issues with the misidentification and when new cases are detected, new rules can be derived to deal with this situation. The submitted information have it's origin in the control regulation. We will look into this issue now that we were alerted to the situation and, if the misidentification is confirmed, we will correct our historical data	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory

PORTUGAL										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1409	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: NA. EcoRegion: NA	VMS data call with OSPAR (Jan 2014): Portugal - missing gear type and the small fleet	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	The requested disaggregation was not in line with DCF regulation. The data sent has demanded a huge amount of time to compile. VMS and catch data are in different data bases not linked with each other. DGMARE is aware of this and an action plan is ongoing to overcome this problem. Data for small scale fisheries don't have the resolution required in the data call, as it's not mandatory for this segment.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1467	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	bss-8c9a: Historical sampling of the commercial catches is of variable quality and data sampling should cover all fleets involved in this fishery. Time-series of relative abundance indices are needed for both the adult and pre-recruit components of the stock.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Portugal doesn't collect biological parameters on sea bass. From 2009 onwards the design has been focused on methods conforming DCF requirements (Commission Decision No. 2010/93/UE) and concurrent sampling has been applied. Since then quarterly length compositions of sea bass landings from division IXa are available. Sea bass discards are recorded by the DCF on-board sampling programme. bss 8c-9a length compositions data have been validated and loaded into InterCatch database 10 April 2014, 19:38:57. At IPMA there is no research line dedicated to sea bass. Current efforts focus in obtaining adequate indicators to inform the MSFD reports. There is also interest in understanding the relative contribution of recreational and illegal fishing to the total species catch and the definition of appropriate technical measures (applicable to both recreational and commercial fishers) that could improve the management of small-scale fisheries (Moreno and Stratoudakis, Working Document for the ICES Working Group on Assessment of New MoU Species (WGNEW), Copenhagen, 18-22 March 2013).	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1469	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	bss-8c9a: Recreational fisheries are likely to contribute substantially to fishery removals in some areas. Time-series of catches, releases, and size/age composition are needed from this component of the fishery to improve the assessment and advice.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Portugal has no evidences of negative impact of recreational fisheries in 9a. Preliminary survey showed low quantities of catches of this species.	This type of issues has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1318	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and migratory stocks	alf-comb: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGDEEP data call submission deadline, but until workshop day and data was available to the stock coordinator	LOW	TIMELINESS	Data submission issue: biological data transmission has been uploaded to Intercatch at 28-March-2014, 18:22:44	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1356	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and migratory stocks	sbr-ix: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGDEEP data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Portugal has received a high number of simultaneous data calls in this period. Data was submitted as requested but some deadlines were not possible to achieve.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1358	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and migratory stocks	sbr-x: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGDEEP data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Data submission issue: biological data transmission has been uploaded to Intercatch at 28-March-2014, 18:29:15	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1452	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and migratory stocks	bsf-nea: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGDEEP data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Data submission issue : biological data transmission has been uploaded to Intercatch at 28-March-2014 and updated with CECAF data at 04-April-2014	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1456	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and migratory stocks	bsf-nea: Fishery and biological data from the CECAF area are required to improve the overall perception of the stock status and particularly of the spawning stock.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Data submitted as requested on 2-April-2014 and uploaded on 3-April-2014. More information is needed on the quality issue referred by the end-user.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory

PORTUGAL										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf_assessment
1472	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCEPH. EcoRegion: NA	Cephalopods: data not delivered in time: survey data 2013 England and Wales, Discard data Wales, ALL data from France	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	These data doesn't concern Portugal.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1481	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	alf-comb: The general absence of data on species composition of the catches and biological parameters are important limiting factors for the knowledge of these fish stocks.	MEDIUM	QUALITY	This is a general comment that does not applie to Portugal. The data from Azores are the only that include detailed biological information for both species of Beryx.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1486	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCEPH. EcoRegion: NA	Cephalopods: There is still a data clarification request process to be deployed in relation to: a) Species (even family level!) identification in the catches and landings (northern countries and France) b) Discards: more biological data related to cephalopods (already being collected by some countries). c) Discard data: sampled level for discard for submission. All data should be raised.	MEDIUM	QUALITY	Discard raise issue: The vast majority of cephalopod taxa were rare in the Portuguese OTB discards and when present they were generally discarded in low number, e.g., on average <5 individuals discarded per haul. This low frequency of occurrence and low number of specimens indicates that discards are null or negligible for most ecosystem management and assessment purposes. Overall, total cephalopod discards by the OTBÂ fisheries appear to be <200 tonnes/year in recent years. This value is a rough approximation but indicates cephalopod discards by the OTBÂ fishery are relatively low comparatively to the total landings of cephalopods from portuguese waters (~14 000 tonnes, OTB and otherÂ fleets included) (LourenÂso et al., 2014).	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1519	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	gfb-comb: Discards were provided only by Spain, French, Denmark and Sweden, although the species is discarded by more fleets. Several shelf fisheries have a bycatch of juveniles which is currently poorly estimated. Discards reported do not cover the entire distributional area of the stock	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Discards issue : At the time of WGDEEP, the full 2005-2013 data set of effort data was not available. Thus, gfb-comb discards were not quantified at fleet level. There are no significant discards of this species in area X (Azores).	MS is requested (if not already done) to provide discard estimates time series to the stock coordinator for future assessment.	Satisfactory
1520	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	gfb-comb: Although most of the countries reported data by species, landings in Subarea IX reported as Phycis spp. might include Phycis phycis	LOW	QUALITY	In Subarea IX since 2001 small amounts of Phycis spp (probably Phycis phycis) have been landed in ports of the Strait of Gibraltar by the longliner fleet targeting scabbardfish in Algeciras, Barbate and Conil (ICES, 2014. WGDEEP report). It doesn't include Portuguese data	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory

## ROMANIA

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
439	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		High fluctuations in reported figures for several parameters. Impact: Suggests incomplete data coverage	HIGH	COVERAGE	Resulting differences between years of the total number of vessels, total kw and total gt is due to variations which occur from year to year and even within the same year of the number of vessels (large differences appear between period 2008 to 2010 and the period 2011 - 2014 when the number of vessels has reduced by half, and even more). Most of the times ships which have been active in the course of a year will become inactive in another year and vice versa (this by default brings modifications in relation with totKw and totGT. On the other hand may changes occur, over time, by replacing segments of vessels belonging to the VL0006 and VL0612 which usually have other values of technical characteristics (length, kw and gt). A trend in the past two years has been to reduce the fleet segments VL0006 and VL0612 segments in favor VL1218 (without exceeding ceiling kw and gt established for the fishing fleet of Romania) because they are authorized to fish in the coastal offshore zone . Also this fleet segment presents and advantage of several types of fishing gear and carrying out by default catches with high economic value. Resulting differences between years at the landings is due to more than one cause: the size of fishing stocks; the size of fish agglomerations which carries out migrations to Romanian seaside;the hidroclimatic conditions which may favor or disfavor fishing activities (number of fishing days in favorable seasons); variations of fishing effort (number of ships, no. of tools, no. of fishing days, fishing hours , etc. ); orientation of fishing activities to other catches (e.g. fishing of rapa welk (RPW), where catch increased in 2012 by more than 250% as compared to 2011, with more than 200% in 2013 compared to 2012 and more than 50% in the year 2014 as compared to last year 2013); fluctuations in prices generated by market requirements and competition. Regarding the expenses, deviations values are in close liaison with both the amplitude of activities performed, and of the results obtained on each fleet segment (expenses are directly proportional to revenues on each fleet segment). We have zero at dcf_income for the fact that income for fishermen is obtained only from landings. We don't have cases in which fisherman to obtain revenues from franchisees (leasings) or direct subsidies (direct subsidies) or other type of incomes.	MS provided relatively sufficient justification. The high fluctuations in data seems to be due to actual variations in the fishing activity and not to an incomplete data coverage.	Satisfactory
440	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		No data submitted for large-scale fleet segments in 2010. Impact: Incomplete time series, national analysis, EU and regional overviews	HIGH	UNKNOWN	In 2010 only a single ship of 24 to 40 m activated, which fished only 2 days due to poor technical condition. The rest of vessels belonging to the fleet segments 12 to 18 m, and 18 to 24 m were inactive for objective reasons (precarious technical status).	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
104	GFCM	2014	[ None ]	Task 1.2	45% completed - missing data for all variables (33-59% completed)	LOW	COVERAGE	Requested data from task 1.2 for the year 2012 have been fully completed (see task 1 changed)	Assuming that MS has correctly re-submitted the complete table, the answer can be considered acceptable (GFCM should confirm it). The end user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies	Unknown
105	GFCM	2014	[ None ]	Task 1.4	32% completed - no data or missing data on fishing periods (0-33%) , by-catch number (0%), catch/landing value and CPUE/LPUE value of main associated species (50%)	MEDIUM	COVERAGE	Have been completed the missing data from task 1.4 for the year 2012 (see task 1 changed)	Assuming that MS has resubmitted the complete task 1.4, the answer can be considered acceptable (GFCM should confirm if the data have been received).	Unknown
106	GFCM	2014	[ None ]	Task 1.5	30% completed - no data on min and max length (0%), missing data for average length (41%), sex (55%) and maturity scale (55%)	HIGH	COVERAGE	For task 1.5 for the year 2012 there have been made requested changes (see task 1 changed)	Assuming that MS has resubmitted the complete task 1.5, the answer can be considered acceptable (GFCM should confirm if the data have been received)	Unknown
107	GFCM	2014	[ None ]	Submission deadline	all task 1 data submitted 1 month late (26/06/2014)	LOW	TIMELINESS	The delay with a month of the transmission task 1, it was due to the fact that the data required by the JRC in DCF (data recorded in the course of the year), in the task 1 of GFCM were demanded and other additional data which had to be collected later from the documents held by NAFA.	The delay can be considered acceptable. However for the future, MS should try to submit the data respecting the established deadline.Â Should be remarked that all Task 1 data are not used by any working groups, but are only stored in a GFCM database.	Satisfactory
479	JRC	2014	Med and BS		TBB- Beam trawl effort is reported for the first time; it now corresponds to 50% of total fishing effort in Romania	HIGH	COVERAGE	In the year 2013 has been approved the use in fishing of beam trawl, in this case the fleet segments 24 to 40 m, 12 to 18 m and a part of 06 - 12 m concentrated their activity toward collection of rapa welk (RPW) with this type of tool. For this reason, the fishing effort with beam trawl represents 50% of overall effort. On the other hand, the increase in fishing effort is also reflected by an increase in catch of rapa welk (RPW), carried out once with the use in the fisheries of beam trawl. Thus, in 2013 the RPW catch was 230% higher than 2012.	MS answer is acceptable.Â	Satisfactory



ROMANIA										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment

1188	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	<div> <div> <div>Expert group: WGWIDE.</div> <div>EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks</div> </div> <div>mac-nea: Limited sampling for discards has been carried out since 2000, despite a formal requirement initiated in the EU in 2002. Estimating the discarded and slipped proportions of catch is problematic in pelagic fisheries due to high variability in discard and slipping practices. In some fleets no sampling for discards is carried out, including those fleets for which discarding is illegal. The discards included in the catch in the assessment are an underestimate.</div> </div>		MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	<div> <div>Difference of the effort of the annual report is that in the annual report it has been reported to the tool effort strictly TBB-Beam while in reporting JRC (DCF) has been included the effort made by divers for harvesting RPW. Inclusion has been carried out since in the JRC reporting guide (Regulation 93/2010) is not included a code for tool - manual harvesting.</div> <div>This is general comment from WG not addressed to any MS in particular and not applicable to the MS.</div> </div>	Satisfactory
------	------	------	-----------------------	---	--	-------------	---------	--	--------------

## SLOVENIA

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
441	JRC	2014	Fleet economics	Landings and income data not provided for TM VL2440 in 2012. Impact: Incomplete time series / data coverage of national fleet		HIGH	UNKNOWN	In 2012 and 2013 Slovenia implemented the measure of Permanent cessation of fishing activities under the European Fisheries Fund (EFF), Council Regulation (EC) No 1198/2006 of 27 July 2006, on the European Fisheries Fund. Under that measure, in year 2012, also both Slovenian vessels that were LOA above 24 meters were scrapped. Both vessels were active in the segment of TM VL2440. Since they were scrapped, they were not active already in part of the year 2011 and in a year 2012 and never since that. In year 2012 both vessels were moored in the fishing port in Izola and they were waiting to be scrapped. Both vessels always worked in pair with pair pelagic net (PTM). On their last way in 2012 from the port towards the place of scrapping one vessel landed over an empty log book in goodbye from the fishing fleet and fishing activities. However the consequence of that is that we can't send any data regarding the segment TM VL2440, because there is no data to be send. The time series is not incomplete, it is completed and finished. A Zero values for some of the variables (landings, income...) for TM VL 2440 are correct. The coverage is complete.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
442	JRC	2014	Fleet economics	Inconsistent clustering over the time period (PS VL1218). Impact: Incomplete/inaccurate times series analyses		HIGH	COVERAGE	Over the period 2008 - 2014 four vessels represents the segment PS VL1218 (except of the year 2009 when 5 vessels were representing the segment PS VL1218). In some of the years all the vessels were from VL1218 length class and the segment was reported as unclustered. But occasionally one of the vessel from VL1218 is replaced with vessel from length class VL0612 and in those years the segment is reported as clustered. So, the time series is not incomplete or inaccurate, it is completed and accurate. The quality of data is assured.	MS reply is acceptable	Satisfactory
108	GFCM	2014	[ None ]	Task 1.4	30% completed - no data on total effort, catch/landing, discard and by catch value of fishing periods, group by-catch species, by-catch weight and number, and CPUE/LPUE value of main associated species (0%), missing data for the remaining variables (77-78)	MEDIUM	COVERAGE	At the time of the preparation of Task 1 report for year 2012 some Task 1.4 data was not possible to calculate because there are no exact rules how to determine which species are target species. In Mediterranean fisheries and especially in Slovenian fisheries where the predominant way of fishing is small-scale fisheries is very difficult (or even impossible) to determine target species. In multispecies fishery usually more than one species could be considered as target species. All that species are sold on market for human consumption it just depends of the season when a specific species is dominant in the share of the landings. If you insist in determine the target species we can do it only taking in consideration species with the biggest landing.	MS answer is partly acceptable. The issue related to the multi-specificity of the fisheries it is true not only for the Slovenian waters but for all Mediterranean countries, and the approach suggested by MS (introduce in the requested field the species with the highest contribution in landing) could be a solution.Missing information (especially on by-catch regarding weight and number, and/or the CPUE/LPUE value of main associated species) could be related to the mismatch of the DCF metier concept and the GFCM data requests at the level of operational units. Such problems are recurring for many Mediterranean and Black Sea countries and should be solved once the new GFCM DCRF comes into force. For the time being MS should report the requested data. The end user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies	Unknown
109	GFCM	2014	[ None ]	Task 1.5	All Task 1.5 data- not provided (0%)	HIGH	COVERAGE	At the time of the preparation of Task 1 data for 2012 about target species, the data was unavailable and consequentially biological data about target species is missing. As explained in cell related to Task 1.4 it is very difficult to determine target species. In general, regarding Task1 report, more detailed instructions should be provided by GFCM.	MS answer is not acceptable. MS should provide the requested data (i.e. mean length, max and min length, etc.) at least for the main commercial species in the area. For the future, introduction in the new GFCM-DCRF of the concept of priority species could in any case, simplify this issue.	Unsatisfactory
480	JRC	2014	Med and BS		Effort data initially uploaded for 2014 Data Call (and all previous Data Calls) was incorrect and extremely high. New correct version was uploaded after the deadline.	HIGH	QUALITY	Extremely high values were due to a mistake in SQL query. The SQL query was corrected and now it works properly. New data was submitted.Ā	MS answer can be considered acceptable assuming that MS has uploaded the correct set of data (end user should confirm it). Ms has to take appropriate measures to prepare and provide data in due time.	Satisfactory

SLOVENIA

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
----	----------	------	----------	------	-------	----------	------------	------------	---------------	------------------

481	JRC	2014	Med and BS	Catches (Landings , Discards) during the last two years (2012-2013) show a dramatic decline (70-80%)		HIGH	COVERAGE	Like we already explained, in 2012 and 2013 Slovenia implemented the measure of Permanent cessation of fishing activities under the European Fisheries Fund (EFF), Council Regulation (EC) No 1198/2006 of 27 July 2006, on the European Fisheries Fund. Under that measure, in year 2012, also both Slovenian biggest vessels that were LOA above 24 meters were scrapped. Both vessels always worked in pair with pair pelagic net (PTM). They were not active already in part of the year 2011 and in year 2012 and never since that. A dramatic decline in landings is the consequence of the implementation of the measure of Permanent cessation of fishing activities. mainly because of the scrapping of Slovenian's two biggest vessels and 6 more vessels, in total 8 vessels. Our fishing fleet decreased in terms of BT for 37,63 % and in terms of kW for 19,20 %. That affected also on decrease of our landings for 70-80 % in cases of some species even more than 80 %. The quality of the data is assured. The data is accurate and is reflecting the real state of play. The quality of data is assured.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
-----	-----	------	------------	--	--	------	----------	---	--------------------------	--------------

SPAIN										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
343	JRC	2014	Aquaculture		ES figures had to be removed from the price analysis of some species due to missing data on the volume of sales for the years 2008-2010, which affects the average prices significantly.	HIGH	COVERAGE	There is indeed a lack of data between 2008 and 2010. The production was measured only in value (Euros), missing data on physical quantities. These problems were solvent last year and we communicated that to JRC in order to upload all data. Å Conversion factors were calculated for some species that it needed it. All data volume in tones was included in last data call on May 2014. They informed us to submit all data on 2015 data call.	Failure of data submission is not justified. But as far as solution with end user was found, evident should be provided to data transmission evaluation (correspondence with JRC or etc.)in order to making a proper evaluation.	Unknown
443	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Landings data (value and weight) submitted only for 2012. Impact: Incomplete time series, national analysis, EU and regional overviews	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Those data have been submitted in 2015 data call	Submission for DCF is mandatory for all variables and segments unless MS has a derogation. MS does not justify the failure. Provisions should be made to avoid such type of failures in the future.	Unsatisfactory
444	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Effort data (fishing days and days at sea) submitted only for 2012. Impact: Incomplete time series, national analysis, EU and regional overviews	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Data from 2011 to 2013 have been submitted in 2015 data call	Submission for DCF is mandatory for all variables and segments unless MS has a derogation. MS does not justify the failure. Provisions should be made to avoid such type of failures in the future.	Unsatisfactory
445	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Estimated fleet depreciated value submitted only for 2011 and 2012. Impact: Not possible to estimate several economic indicators for missing years; incomplete national analysis, EU and regional overviews	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Data have been submitted in 2015 data call	Submission for DCF is mandatory for all variables and segments unless MS has a derogation. MS does not justify the failure. Provisions should be made to avoid such type of failures in the future.	Unsatisfactory
446	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Significant amount of other missing data at fleet segment level. Impact: Not possible to estimate several economic indicators for missing years; incomplete time series, national analysis, EU and regional overviews	HIGH	UNKNOWN	We request more explanations to end-user	End user does not clearly specify the data transmission issue for the MS to respond and for STECF to make a proper evaluation.	Unknown
447	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Capacity data for 2014 not submitted. Impact: Incomplete time series and EU overview	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Capacity data for 2014 was submitted	The issue raised by end user is not in line with DCF regulation, reference year is the same as data call year. Submission of 2014 capacity data could only be on voluntary basis. Such type of issue should not be raised by end user in the future.	Satisfactory
448	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Capital data for Inactive vessels missing for most years. Impact: Incomplete economic, time-series and national fleet analysis	HIGH	UNKNOWN	Those data have been submitted from 2011	End user does not clearly specify the data transmission issue for the MS to respond and for STECF to make a proper evaluation.	Unknown
449	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Inconsistent clustering over the time period. Impact: Incomplete times series analyses	HIGH	COVERAGE	It is not correct; cluster are correctly explained as indicated in guidelines; internal variation is due to changes in fleet segmentation	End user does not clearly specify the data transmission issue for the MS to respond and for STECF to make a proper evaluation.	Unknown
450	JRC	2014	Fleet economics		Considerable amount of data submitted on 12/09/2014, well after the deadline	HIGH	QUALITY	This date was because an extraordinary open of the data call conceded by JRC to Spain in order to submit values in the correct way (economic and not tonnes). Spain asked it officially in July and JRC responded by re-open the upload possibilities in September during 24 hours.Å	MS' s should ensure that data call deadlines are respected	Unsatisfactory
497	JRC	2014	Processing		The following economic variables were not provided: depreciation of capital, debt, total value of assets.	LOW	UNKNOWN	Due to the survey made by INE. We are working to solvent it.	Submission for DCF is mandatory for all variables and segments unless MS has a derogation. MS does not justify the failure. Provisions should be made to avoid such type of failures in the future.	Unsatisfactory
110	GFCM	2014	[ None ]	Task 1.3	36% completed - no data provided on employment, salary share, vessel value total fleet, working hours per/day, variable costs fishing/day, % variable costs from fuel and yearly fixed costs (0%)	MEDIUM	COVERAGE	The variables, which are taken with the necessary aggregation in compliance with Commission Decision (2010/93 / EU), were sent. The request of economic data by the GFCM does not conform to the stratifications of Community regulations "data Collection": Regulation (EC) No. 1543/2000; Regulation (EC) No. 199/2008 on the following aspects: The Mediterranean economic data does not conform to the stratifications of Community regulations "data Collection": Regulation (EC) No. 1543/2000; Regulation (EC) No. 199/2008 on the following aspects: 1)Å The stratification of the fleet which calls on the GFCM, for gear, length and size of GSA areas, is more disaggregated than that it given in the EU regulations cited above. This would involve a redesign of the Economic Survey of Marine Fisheries, held in Spain, and in many strata having to conduct a thorough investigation of all elements of the population, being overly fractional this population. Å 2) The costs of conducting the survey would increase without being guaranteed the quality of the survey, as it would likely increase the lack of response from the respondents. As we explain in the mail with the data and we have manifested in CGPM Working Groups, our socio-economic data are in the line of DCF. Nowadays we have not possibilities to submit data behind other request.	The explanation given by MS is not acceptable. Spain is member of the GFCM and data should be submitted (i.e. following the requested aggregation, stratification etc.) in agreement with the GFCM Recommendation as also endorsed by EU regulation (EU Reg. 1343/2011). Moreover, should be underlined that all the assessment, management etc. in the Mediterranean and Black Sea area are conducted at GSA level, accordingly, data should be reported at this level.Å	Unknown

SPAIN										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
111	GFCM	2014	[ None ]	Task 1.4	55% completed - no data on total effort and catch/landing value of fishing periods, group by-catch species and by-catch weight and number (0%), missing data for by-catch value (32%)	LOW	COVERAGE	Total effort: It is not available Catch/landing value: It is provided By-catch and discard value is provided in the operative units sampled	MS answer is acceptable. Missing information (especially on bycatch regarding weight and number, and/or the CPUE/LPUE value of main associated species) could be related to the mismatch of the DCF metier concept and the GFCM data requests at the level of operational units. Such problems are recurring for many Mediterranean and Black Sea countries and should be solved once the new GFCM DCRF comes into force. The end user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies	Unknown
112	GFCM	2014	[ None ]	Task 1.5	27% completed - no dat on maturity scale, missing data for all other variables (24-37% completed)	MEDIUM	COVERAGE	Maturity scale and sex ratio data are only collected in the target species: Aristeus antennatus, Engraulis encrasicolus, Lophius budegassa, Merluccius merluccius, Micromesistius poutassou, Mullus barbatus, Mullus surmuletus, Nephrops norvegicus, Octopus vulgaris, Parapenaeus longirostris, Sardina pilchardus, Trachurus trachurus, Trachurus mediterraneus, Scomber colias. Length data are only collected in G1, G2 and G3 species.	As stated by MS, assuming that data are collected and reported only for the main commercial species in the country, the answer is acceptable. The requested field, based only on the maturity scale used to determine the stage of maturity for that species, should be also reported. The end user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies	Unknown
113	ICCAT	2014	[ None ]	T1FC: Fleet Characteristics	no data for Mediterranean fleets: LL, PS & BB; Canary ISL. BB fleet; ETRO fleets: PS & BB; Cantabrian fleet: LL surface, TROLL fleet, BB fleet	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	In 2015 we will proporcionate 2014 data. Nowadays absence of those data do not affect task I and II	MS answer is not acceptable. Despite the fact (as stated only by MS and not by the end user) that the missing information did not affected task I and II, requested data should be submitted also for 2014.	Unsatisfactory
114	ICCAT	2014	[ None ]	T1NC: Nominal Catches	questionable data quality for all fleets and gear groups	LOW	QUALITY	We do not understand this comment. Our data are obtained from official data.	MS answer is justified. Feedback on which data were considered "questionable" would be needed. The end user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies	Satisfactory
115	ICCAT	2014	[ None ]	T2SW/CAS: Catch-at size	no data on any large tuna species with exception of the LL fleet for swordfish	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	Please, check this information	No answer given by MS. MS should clarify this missing information or provide the data as requested	Unsatisfactory
116	RCM	2014	[ None ]	NS&EA: comercial landings, effort and sampling	failed to upload data to the RDB	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	It is correct. But Spain has in several ocassions manifested that we have some doubts with RDB: first with the protection data and then with the obligation to submit data (it is not specified in Eurpean legislation). But we are working in order to submit data this year Å	This is a political issue, which should be clarified by proper authorities. Issue to be investigated by DGMARE	Unknown
117	RCM	2014	[ None ]	NS&EA: comercial landings, effort and sampling	missing data on commercial landings and commercial effort for RY 2009-2012	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	Due to action plan as we have explained several times	This is a political issue, which should be clarified by proper authorities. Issue to be investigated by DGMARE	Unknown
119	WCPFC	2014	[ None ]	CMM 2007-01 Attachment K Annex C06	no data for longliners ( minimum of 5% is required)	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	This comment is referered to the effort coverage. Not observers in this fleet, but we are studing the situation	Answer to be checked prior to accept it. If there's no obligations for observers to cover this fleet the answer given by MS can be considered acceptable.	Unknown
120	WCPFC	2014	[ None ]	SciData 03	missing opertional data for longliners on branchlines between floats, discards information, data related to key shark species, number of fish caught (fundamental requirement for stock assessments in the WCPFC)	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	We are working in this point	MS answer is not acceptable. MS should report the requested data. End user should verify and confirm if requested data will be correctly uploaded.	Unsatisfactory
121	WCPFC	2014	[ None ]	SciData 05	no size data provided by any fleet segment	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	As stablshs in WCPFC, if operational data are sent, the member must not preapre agregatted data. So aggregated data only must be sent for that states that do not sent operational data.Å	The end user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies	Unknown
122	RCM	2014	[ None ]	NA: size data	failure to upload length data although in AR	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	We are not obliged under the DCF to upload DCF data in international data bases.	This is a political issue, which should be clarified by proper authorities. Issue to be investigated by DGMARE	Unknown
123	IOTC	2014	[ None ]	long line fisheries	submitted more than half a year late (17/2/2015 instead of 30/06/2014)	UNKNOWN	TIMELINESS	Data have been sent	End user should verify and confirm if requested data have been correctly uploaded. Moreover, despite the delay of the transmission, if the MS has submitted the data due time before the WG, the answer could be considered acceptable, otherwise no.	Unknown
124	IOTC	2014	[ None ]	Coastal fisheries	no data submitted	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	This obligation is not for spanish fleet	Answer to be checked prior to accept it.	Unknown
125	ICCAT	2014	[ None ]	T2CE: Catch and Effort	questionable data quality for the Canary Islands (apart from BFT) and Cant_Alb for all gear groups	LOW	QUALITY	We don not understant this comment. Our data are of enough quality	MS answer is justified. Feedback on which data have been considered "questionable" would be needed. The end user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies	Satisfactory
376	JRC	2014	Effort		No data for 2010 and 2011.	HIGH	UNKNOWN	No data for that years because an action plan accorded in relation to transversal variables for that years.Å	MS reply not clear. Submission for DCF is mandatory for all transversal variables unless MS has a derogation. Is this "action plan" a derogation?	Unsatisfactory



SPAIN										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
377	JRC	2014	Effort		Table E, landings by rectangle: no data for 2003-2011. No information on special conditions in 2012 data. Vessel length categories, allowed activity, fishing activity and fishing capacity were not identified in data from 2002-2008 in areas 8c and 9a. Data for years before 2010: no EU/RFMO/COAST identification for ICES Subarea 10 and Divisions 7j, 7k, 8d, 8e, 8b, 14b and CECAF areas 34.1.2 and 34.2.0.	HIGH	UNKNOWN	As we explained several times, we did not have vessels with special conditions in 2012. Respect to "No information on special conditions in 2012 data", the information is in the respective report "STECF Evaluation of Fishing Effort Regimes in European Waters - Part 2 (STECF-14-20)", page 86 : "In ICES Divisions 8c and 9a there were no special condition (IIB72ab) landings (Hake Plan) in 2012 and 2013 because no vessel in those years has applied for that condition in relation to hake and Nephrops recovery plan (Annex IIB of R(EU)No 43/2012 and No. 39/2013)." This comment was already answered in the 2013 Data Transmission Failures.	MS reply is acceptable only for the issue on special conditions in 2012. For all the other issues, MS does not give any justification.Â	Unsatisfactory
482	JRC	2014	Med and BS		Spain has submitted all data after the official deadline of 9th June 2014	HIGH	QUALITY	Following the recommendation of RCM Med&BS 2011 and 2012 (see below), The Spanish NP specifies the minimum period to submit the data, six months after the collection of the data."RCMMed&BS, recalling its 2011 recommendation and also the STECF EWG 11-20 recommendation on a harmonized time period required for data to be available for transmission to end-users, recommends that the time period of 6 months following the end of the collection of transversal and biological data is respected by the data calls and the end users. In case this time period of 6 months continues not being respected by the data calls, the Group stresses the importance that the National Correspondents follow a common approach requesting the respect of this time period and NOT submit the data".	The non-harmonization between the period on which data will be available, described under the NP (sections on data presentation), and the different requests of data from end-user can generate these problems. DGMARE should clarify this issue.Â However, if MS has submitted the data due time before the WG, the delay can be considered acceptable, otherwise no.Â	Unknown
483	JRC	2014	Med and BS		Effort data and Catch data (Landings, Discards) are inconsistent: large effort values in many years-areas-gears are accompanied by very low or no catches at all	HIGH	COVERAGE	Due to the multispecies characteristic of some Mediterranean metiers, effort can be high but catches from bycatch species can be relatively very low	MS answer is not acceptable. MS answer does not explain clearly and in sufficient detail why landing and discard data are inconsistent. Â MS should provide the requested data at least for the main commercial species in the area.	Unsatisfactory
484	JRC	2014	Med and BS		The numbers of fish for Sardine in GSA 6 and 1 derived from MEDIAS (Abundance table) in 2012 and 2013 appears to be orders of magnitude higher than older years, this is most likely an error and data will need to be corrected.	HIGH	COVERAGE	We agree, the error will be corrected in the next data call.	MS will send the requested data. End user should verify if during the forthcoming data call requested data will be correctly reported.Â	Unknown
118	IATTC	2014	[ None ]		no data for longliners	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	We have sent all data availables	MS answer can be considered acceptable	Satisfactory
1011	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WBGIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	anb-78ab: Efforts should be made to obtain reliable estimates of total catches in order to improve the assessment.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Done. In 2015, Spain has provided a review of 2011-2013 data	MS answer can be considered acceptable	Satisfactory
1034	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WBGIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	anb-78ab: Accurate estimates of growth parameters are needed to facilitate the development of an analytical assessment.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	The growth parameters for Atlantic stocks of L.budegassa will be available when there is enough results on them and certainty that they are sufficiently accurate to reflect reality, just as what has been done in L.piscatorius. It is important to avoid what happened until 2007, until which age-structured models were applied to the assessment of this stock although uncertainty on growth pattern and other deficiencies were evidenced by Azevedo et al. (2008). Until now, interesting recent studies have been conducted in micro-increments of L.budegassa that will help significantly to the correct interpretation the first annual ring in the calcified structures and thus allow more accurate pattern and parameters of growth. However more studies to advance further in it are required.- Azevedo, M., Cardador, F., Costas, G., Duarte, R., Fariña, A.C., Landa, J., Sampedro, M.P., 2008. Final Report: Improving the quality of southern anglerfish stocks assessment (ABA), (UE DG FISH/2004/03-22).	This type of issue should be dealt with by WGBIOP	Satisfactory

SPAIN										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1041	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	anb-78ab: increased discarding in recent years has resulted in uncertainties in recent catch values. An increase in the discard sampling level is necessary for providing catch advice.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	It is not possible to increase the discard sampling level for economic reasons due to the high numbers of trips needed to reduce a little the error. This species is caught in mixed fisheries and discards of this species are high only in cases of high recruitment.	MS answer can be considered acceptable	Satisfactory
1077	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	gug-89a: The data for catches of grey gurnard are considered highly unreliable. Catch statistics are incomplete and are often not separated by species.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Done. The quality of the 2014 GUG data have been improved considerably	MS answer can be considered acceptable	Satisfactory
1081	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	anb-8c9a: The lack of a validated age-reading criterion precludes the use of assessment models based on age data. Due to the broad size range of the species, length sampling should be increased to ensure adequate data for future development of improved assessment methods.	MEDIUM	QUALITY	The length sampling is done with concurrent sampling, as DCF requires, not by species. It is not possible to increase the length sampling level for economic reasons.Â	MS answer is acceptable. The problem should be directed to the relevant RCM.	Satisfactory
1088	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGHANSA. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	ane-pore: Although discards in anchovy fisheries are generally thought to be negligible, there is insufficient information to confirm this.	MEDIUM	QUALITY	The discards sampling on purse seine presents appropriate coverage in Division IXa.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1117	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and migratory stocks	hke-nrth: Assessment data arrived after the ICES data call deadline, thus reducing time to review and audit the assessment results. Although the data were used, the delay may reduce ICES quality assurance.	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Â Due to some changes in the method there was a delay, but data were sent to the expert group before the celebration. The submitting process has been improved. 2015 hke-nrth data were submitted on time.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1126	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and migratory stocks	hke-nrth: Only partial discards are included in the assessment and forecast. In order to reduce uncertainty in discard estimates, an increased sampling level for on-board observer programmes is needed for some fleets (non-Nephrops trawlers, gillnetters, and longliners).	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This issue makes reference to non-Spanish trawl métiers. Regarding gillnetters and longline sampling on board, they are not included in the DCF contract. It is not possible to increase the discard sampling level for economic reasons. Furthermore, previous studies demonstrate that both longline and gillnet do not generate hake discards, or do at a very low level.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1135	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and migratory stocks	hke-nrth: There is large uncertainty associated with the estimation of discards. Hake otoliths are currently collected but not used in the assessment due to lack of a validated ageing method. The utility of the current sampling and its level should be re-evaluated.	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN	Uncertainties on discards of hake are the same or even lower than many species. As it is said to other stocks it is not possible to increase the discard sampling level for economic reasons due to the high numbers of trips needed to reduce a little the error. Respect to otoliths collection: we are obliged to collect otoliths by the DCF, data are not collected only for the present WGs, but also for the future.	MS answer is acceptable.Â This type of issues has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory

## SPAIN

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1146	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	hke-soth: Hake otoliths are currently collected but not used in the assessment due to lack of a validated ageing method. The utility of the current sampling and its level should be re-evaluated.	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN	We are obliged to collect otoliths by the DCF, data are not collected only for the present WGs, but also for the future.	MS answer is acceptable.Â This type of issues has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1148	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	hke-soth: The P-TR lpue series has not been updated since 2011. The SP-CORUTR lpue series was not updated in 2013. These lpue series, used to calibrate the model, are the main source of information trends for large fish. The influence of this lack of update on the quality of the assessment has not been evaluated.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	A revision of the SP-CORUTR8c tuning indices was submitted to WGBIE 2015 for the period 2009-2014.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1158	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	hom-west: As in previous years, and despite the data sampling regulations for EU countries, some countries with major catches have not conducted biological sampling programmes.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	There is a sampling programme in Spain for this stock (otoliths, length, individual weight, sex, maturity, ...). In fact in 2013 were readed 3355 otoliths of horse mackerel in the ICES Divisions VIIIc and VIIIb. In 2014 VIIIc and VIIIb hom-west catch by age of 2013 were presented to the 2014 WGWIDE. See sampling intensity table in page 10 (section 1.3.1) of 2014 WGWIDE report, Spain is the country with the highest sampled catch percentage.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1167	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	hom-west: Not all countries provide data on discards; consequently, there is no estimate of the total amount of discards in the horse mackerel fisheries.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	The information on Spanish discards for the period 2003-2013 was available in the 2014 group, despite in the group's report only appears for the year 2013.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1187	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	mac-nea: Limited sampling for discards has been carried out since 2000, despite a formal requirement initiated in the EU in 2002. Estimating the discarded and slipped proportions of catch is problematic in pelagic fisheries due to high variability in discard and slipping practices. In some fleets no sampling for discards is carried out, including those fleets for which discarding is illegal. The discards included in the catch in the assessment are an underestimate.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	It is not possible to increase the discard sampling level for economic reasons. - In the respective Spanish fleets there is discard sampling.Â	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1203	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	mgb-8c9a: Assessment data arrived after the ICES data call deadline, thus reducing time to review and audit the assessment results. Although the data were used, the delay may reduce ICES quality assurance	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Data was sent before working group. Teh submitting process has been improved in 2015	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1213	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	mgw-8c9a: Assessment data arrived after the ICES data call deadline, thus reducing time to review and audit the assessment results. Although the data were used, the delay may reduce ICES quality assurance.	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Data was sent before working group. The submitting process has been improved in 2015.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory

SPAIN										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1230	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	mur-west: Regular biological sampling of striped red mullet catches is expected to continue under the EU Data Collection Framework, but the frequency is currently insufficient to calculate catch-at-age outside the Bay of Biscay and Divisions VIIe74-h.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Â It is not possible to increase the discard sampling level for economic reasons. - There are not Spanish landings of Mullus spp, Mullus surmuletus nor Mullus barbatus in ICES Subarea VII.Â	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1239	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	Nep-25: 2013 landings and biological sampling data not submitted in time to WGBIE data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Data was sent before working group. The submitting process has been improved in 2015.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1240	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	Nep-2627: 2013 landings and biological sampling data not submitted in time to WGBIE data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Data was sent before working group. The submitting process has been improved in 2015.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1241	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	Nep-2829: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGBIE data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Data was sent before working group. The submitting process has been improved in 2015.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1245	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	Nep-30: 2013 landings and biological sampling data not submitted in time to WGBIE data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Data was sent before working group. The submitting process has been improved in 2015.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1246	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	Nep-31: 2013 landings and biological sampling data not submitted in time to WGBIE data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Data was sent before working group. The submitting process has been improved in 2015.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1249	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WBGIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	anp-78ab: An increase in the discard sampling level is necessary for providing catch advice.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	It is not possible to increase the discard sampling level for economic reasons.	This type of issues has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory

SPAIN										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1274	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	anp-78ab: Accurate estimates of growth parameters are needed to facilitate the development of an analytical assessment	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	As far as we are aware, accurate estimates of the growth pattern of <i>L. piscatorius</i> for this stock are those based in illicia age estimation and indirectly validated by tracking cohorts and length-frequency analyses, for the ICES Divisions VIIb-k, in the IEO study of Landa et al. (2013). The growth parameters were: $L_{\infty}$ : 162.31; $k$ : 0.088; $t_0$ : -0.894, and are available for the stock assessment using growth information. Other accurate estimates of the growth pattern of <i>L. piscatorius</i> , but not for the requested stock, are those based in illicia age estimation and also indirectly validated by tagging-recapture results and length-frequency analyses, presented for northern waters, in ICES Division Vb (Faroeese waters), in the study of Ofstad et al. (2013). It shows a similar growth pattern to that aforementioned for Divisions VIIb-k. In addition to these growth parameters provided in both studies, it would be useful to have also those from the other areas of the requested stock for the assessment. Recommendation for an international collaborative study in age and growth of <i>L. piscatorius</i> was proposed by ICES (2014) and it could help improve more quickly in this subject. - $\hat{A}$ $\hat{A}$ ICES. 2014. Report of the Planning Group on Commercial Catches, Discards and Bio-logical Sampling (PGCCDBS 2013), 18-22 February 2013, Belfast, Northern Ireland. ICES CM 2013/ACOM: 49. 124 pp.- Landa, J., Barrado, J., Velasco, F. 2013. Age and growth of anglerfish ( <i>Lophius piscatorius</i> ) on the Porcupine Bank (west of Ireland) based on illicia age estimation. Fisheries Research, 137: 30-40.- Ofstad, L.H., Angus, C., Pedersen, T. and Steingrund, P. 2013. Age and growth of anglerfish ( <i>Lophius piscatorius</i> ) in Faroeese waters. Fisheries Research 139:51- 60.	This type of issue should be dealt with by WGBIOP	Satisfactory
1293	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	ple-89a: There are concerns about the reliability of the 2008%-2009 French data. Landings statistics need to be quality assured and confirmed for the region, and associated effort should be compiled.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Spanish landings statistics have quality assured and confirmed for the region, and associated effort is compiled	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1297	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	anp-78ab: Reliable estimates of discards are not available	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Spain provides reliable estimates of discards for this stock. It is not possible to increase the discard sampling level for economic reasons due to the high numbers of trips needed for reduce a little the error. This species is caught in mixed fisheries and discards of this species is high only in cases of high recruitment.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1315	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	pol-89a: Data on growth, maturity, and discards from the fisheries are needed.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	The discarding of this species is very small and usually zero. All the discard data available $\hat{A}$ (1994, 1997, 1999-2000 and 2003-2012) were presented to the WGBIE in $\hat{A}$ 2013. In 2014 no information on this species was requested by WGBIE (not for growth, not for maturity, not for discards). In 2015 this species information was requested by WGBIE and the information has been already uploaded in Intercatch.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1319	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	pol-89a: Recreational catches of pollack may be substantial but are not quantified.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	We have to check this data	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory



SPAIN										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1359	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: AFWG. EcoRegion: Barents Sea	smn-arct: Catch data are in most cases reported for 74% "redfish", without distinction between Sebastes mentella and S. norvegicus. Allocation of catch to beaked redfish is done a posteriori with unquantified uncertainty. Catch numbers-at-age used in the assessment rely on appropriate age sampling and reading. In 2012 and 2013 there was no age reading from the pelagic fishery, and numbers-at-age had to be derived from past age distributions and total catch numbers. Discards are believed to be low, so catch is assumed to equate to landings	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	In 2013 Spain had only two fisheries in Divisions ICES I and II (Eastern Arctic):- Arctic cod fishery: The fleet catches mainly cod with few by-catches of Redfish that represent a low percentage of the total catch and they are reported as Sebastes spp. - Redfish pelagic fishery: Here the effort is directed to Sebastes mentella. In 2013 Spain only made 4 short trips with a few days of the observers at sea (4 days, 5 hauls); what did not allow a proper sampling .	MS should carry out sampling according to the DCF for pelagic redfish	Satisfactory
1363	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: AFWG. EcoRegion: Barents Sea	smn-arct: The sample size of aged S. mentella should be increased to ensure that reliable age-length keys can be estimated, in particular in the Norwegian Sea.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	In 2013 Spain made 4 short trips in Divisions I-II ICES as a result of the transit between several fishing grounds and only it was possible keep an observer on board for 4 days (5 hauls). For this reason Sebastes mentella was undersampled for the variable Length@Age. In these fisheries is not possible predict the planned individuals number to sample when the observer is on board because the duration of trips may vary depending on the owner's decisions.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1367	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	sol-8c9a: Assessment data arrived after the ICES data call deadline, thus reducing time to review and audit the assessment results. Although the data were used, the delay may reduce ICES quality assurance.	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Data was sent before the working group. The submitting process has been improved in 2015	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1369	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	sol-8c9a: Discards are only quantified for part of the fisheries; in Division IXa discards are considered negligible.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	The comment is not clear, discards only quantified for part of the fisheries? Discards of sole are quantified for the same areas and fleets than for the rest of the species (discard sampling is by meters, not by species). The discards of this species are negligible, since its high economic value.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1370	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	sol-8c9a: Specific data on life history parameters and length composition are only available for part of Division IXa and should be collected for other areas.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	The Spanish landings of this stock are smaller than 200 tons by year, therefore Spain does not have to carry out biological sampling of this stock according to the rules of the EC Decision 93/2010 (DCF regulation).	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1371	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	sol-8c9a: There is strong evidence of species misidentification in the landings statistics regarding sole species in this area: Solea solea, Solea senegalensis, and Pegusa lascaris. The Spanish reported landings are already corrected to correspond only to Solea solea.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Yes, the Spanish reported landings correspond only to Solea solea.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1410	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: NA. EcoRegion: NA	VMS data call with OSPAR (Jan 2014): Spain - submitted after Summer 2014	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	We have explained that. First the data call is very huge to prepare in only one month, second we have expressed in several occasions our concerns about data protection, and finally the scope of data collection framework is superated in this data call.	This is not the forum to discuss such issues. This discussion should take place between the MS and the Commission	Unknown

SPAIN										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1417	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	whg-89a: There are concerns about the reliability of the 2008%-2009 French data. Landings statistics need to be quality assured and confirmed for the region.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Spanish landings statistics have quality assured and confirmed for the region	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1459	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	bss-8ab: Historical sampling of the commercial catches is of variable quality and data sampling should cover all fleets involved in this fishery. Time-series of relative abundance indices are needed for both the adult and pre-recruit components of the stock	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Spain is working in 2015 in order to compile a LPUE time series for BSS	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1463	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	bss-8ab: Recreational fisheries are likely to contribute substantially to fishery removals in some areas. Time-series of catches, releases, and size/age composition are needed from this component of the fishery to improve the assessment and advice.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	We are checking this point	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1466	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	bss-8c9a: Historical sampling of the commercial catches is of variable quality and data sampling should cover all fleets involved in this fishery. Time-series of relative abundance indices are needed for both the adult and pre-recruit components of the stock.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Spain is working in 2015 in order to compile a LPUE time series for BSS.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1468	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	bss-8c9a: Recreational fisheries are likely to contribute substantially to fishery removals in some areas. Time-series of catches, releases, and size/age composition are needed from this component of the fishery to improve the assessment and advice.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	We are checking this point	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1010	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	alf-comb: 2013 landings, discard and biological sampling data not submitted in time to WGDEEP data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	The WG date is too soon. Some years before WGDEEP worked with n-2 years data and it was not a problem. Suddenly the WG started to work with n-1 year data but the date still being very soon in the year. At this data, previous year data by metier are not already prepared. We have warned about this many times in the last years and also we have ask for delaying the WG date but we have not receive any answer.	If the data call request the MS to submit certain data then the MS should provide the data. The optimal timing should be discussed in another forum (e.g. WG).	Satisfactory
1178	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCSE. EcoRegion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland	ang-ivi: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGCSE data call submission deadline, but until workshop day - discard, and biological sampling data on landings and discrad missing	LOW	TIMELINESS	Data was provided before working group. Landings: The submitting process has been Å improved in 2015. Discards and biological sampling: there are no Spainsh mÃ©tiers catching anglerfish in these areas, therefore landings are almost negligible, there are no discard data nor biological sampling	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory

SPAIN										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1183	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	lin-oth: 2013 landings, discard and biological sampling data not submitted in time to WGDEEP data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	The WG date is too soon. Some years before WGDEEP worked with n-2 years data and it was not a problem. Suddenly the WG started to work with n-1 year data but the date still being very soon in the year. At this data, previous year data by metier are not already prepared. We have warned about this many times in the last years and also we have ask for delaying the WG date but we have not receive any answer.	If the data call request the MS to submit discard estimates then the MS should provide the data. The optimal timing should be discussed in another forum (e.g. WG). ICES should respond to the question raised by the MS	Satisfactory
1200	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCSE. EcoRegion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland	meg-4a6a: missing discards data, however the assessment is not sensitive to the lack of discards data; the lack of these data has minimal impact on fishing mortality estimates and results in a slight higher estimate of biomass	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	There are not Spanish landings of Lepidorhombus spp, Lepidorhombus whiffiagonis and Lepidorhombus bosciil in ICES divisions IVa and VIa.Å	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1207	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCSE. EcoRegion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland	mgw-78: Assessment data arrived after the ICES data call deadline, thus reducing time to review and audit the assessment results.	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Data was sent before working group. The submitting process has been improved in 2015	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1267	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCSE. EcoRegion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland	nep-VII-FU16: Discard observer coverage is low and should be increased, to better sample the landings and any discards that might be occurring.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	It is not possible to increase the discard sampling level for economic reasons.	This type of issues has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1270	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	ory-comb: the stock recovery cannot be monitored with current monitoring data	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Hoplostethus atlanticus landings are negligible in Spanish metiers operating in European waters. There are hardly any data for this stock. It is not targeted and is not registered by scientific observers on board either (retained catch and discards). Spain is not obliged to perform biological sampling of this stock, following the rules of the decision 93/2010 (DCF regulation).	This type of issues has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1325	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	rng-1012: There are many gaps in fishery and biological data for the roundnose grenadier on the Mid-Atlantic Ridge. To improve the advice for the stock, regular data collection by observers on board commercial vessels needs to be established. The required information must contain data on gear type, length, age composition, maturation and feeding of the species, spatial distribution of its aggregations, as well as size and composition of catches, efforts, cpue, and discards. This information should be presented to ICES annually. rng-500/: The current assessment method does not use catches from Division XIIb. Exploratory assessments were carried out using these data but are not yet considered to be reliable for advice. Fishing activity in Division XIIb currently may contribute to around 30% of the catch. The actual level of catch has been considered uncertain for several years because of problems with species reporting and misreporting to/from other areas. As this issue strongly impacts the quality of the assessment, it is necessary that substantial efforts are made to increase the monitoring of the fishery	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Regular data collection by observers on board commercial vessels is already established in the Spanish fleet. It provides the required information mentioned (CREO). We are not obliged to collect feeding information under the DCF.Å	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1327	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks		HIGH	QUALITY	We are checking that point	Awaiting problem response from MS..	Unknown

SPAIN										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1338	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	rng-oth: This assessment unit consists of a number of discrete areas in which only very small catches of roundnose grenadier occur. Improvement of the advice for the stock will require regular data collection by observers on board commercial vessels. The required information must contain data on gear type, length%-age composition, maturation and feeding of the species, spatial distribution, as well as size and composition of catches, effort, and discards. This information should be presented to ICES annually.	LOW	QUALITY	Regular data collection by observers on board commercial vessels is already established in the Spanish fleet. It provides the required information mentioned (CREO). We are not obliged to collect feeding information under the DCF.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1341	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	rng-rest: 2013 discard and biological sampling data of discard not submitted in time to WGDEEP data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	The WG date is too soon. Some years before WGDEEP worked with n-2 years data and it was not a problem. Suddenly the WG started to work with n-1 year data but the date still being very soon in the year. At this data, previous year data by metier are not already prepared. We have warned about this many times in the last years and also we have ask for delaying the WG date but we have not receive any answer.	If the data call request the MS to submit certain data then the MS should provide the data. The optimal timing should be discussed in another forum (e.g. WG).	Satisfactory
1342	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	arg-oth: 2013 discard not submitted in time to WGDEEP data call submission deadline, but until workshop day, landings missing in InterCatch.	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	The WG date is too soon. Some years before WGDEEP worked with n-2 years data and it was not a problem. Suddenly the WG started to work with n-1 year data but the date still being very soon in the year. At this data, previous year data by metier are not already prepared. We have warned about this many times in the last years and also we have ask for delaying the WG date but we have not receive any answer.	If the data call request the MS to submit certain data then the MS should provide the data. The optimal timing should be discussed in another forum (e.g. WG). ICES should respond to the question raised by the MS.	Satisfactory
1346	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	rng-soth: 2013 discard data not submitted in time to WGDEEP data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	The WG date is too soon. Some years before WGDEEP worked with n-2 years data and it was not a problem. Suddenly the WG started to work with n-1 year data but the date still being very soon in the year. At this data, previous year data by metier are not already prepared. We have warned about this many times in the last years and also we have ask for delaying the WG date but we have not receive any answer. In several occasions we have asked officially to delay the celebration. As you know European legislation closes FIDES report on 15th February.	If the data call request the MS to submit certain data then the MS should provide the data. The optimal timing should be discussed in another forum (e.g. WG). ICES should respond to the question raised by the MS.	Satisfactory
1353	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	sbr-678: 2013 landing, discard and biol. Sampling data not submitted in time to WGDEEP data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	The WG date is too soon. Some years before WGDEEP worked with n-2 years data and it was not a problem. Suddenly the WG started to work with n-1 year data but the date still being very soon in the year. At this data, previous year data by metier are not already prepared. We have warned about this many times in the last years and also we have ask for delaying the WG date but we have not receive any answer.	If the data call request the MS to submit certain data then the MS should provide the data. The optimal timing should be discussed in another forum (e.g. WG). ICES should respond to the question raised by the MS.	Satisfactory
1357	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	sbr-ix: 2013 landings, discard, biol. Data data not submitted in time to WGDEEP data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	The WG date is too soon. Some years before WGDEEP worked with n-2 years data and it was not a problem. Suddenly the WG started to work with n-1 year data but the date still being very soon in the year. At this data, previous year data by metier are not already prepared. We have warned about this many times in the last years and also we have ask for delaying the WG date but we have not receive any answer.	If the data call request the MS to submit certain data then the MS should provide the data. The optimal timing should be discussed in another forum (e.g. WG).	Satisfactory
1382	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	arg-oth: Improvements in data sampling that would be beneficial for the current assessment include biological sampling from the EU fisheries	MEDIUM	QUALITY	The Spanish fleet operating in European waters is not targeting Argentina silus. The Spanish landings of this species are smaller than 200 tons by year, therefore Spain does not have to carry out biological sampling of its stocks according to the rules of the EC Decision 93/2010 (DCF regulation).	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory

SPAIN										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1403	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	usk-oth 2013 landings and discard not submitted in time to WGDEEP data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	The WG date is too soon. Some years before WGDEEP worked with n-2 years data and it was not a problem. Suddenly the WG started to work with n-1 year data but the date still being very soon in the year. At this data, previous year data by metier are not already prepared. We have warned about this many times in the last years and also we have ask for delaying the WG date but we have not receive any answer.Â	If the data call request the MS to submit data then the MS should provide the data. The optimal timing should be discussed in another forum (e.g. WG).	Satisfactory
1404	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	bli-5b67: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGDEEP data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	The WG date is too soon. Some years before WGDEEP worked with n-2 years data and it was not a problem. Suddenly the WG started to work with n-1 year data but the date still being very soon in the year. At this data, previous year data by metier are not already prepared. We have warned about this many times in the last years and also we have ask for delaying the WG date but we have not receive any answer.Â	If the data call request the MS to submit certain data then the MS should provide the data. The optimal timing should be discussed in another forum (e.g. WG). The Commission should respond to the question raised by the MS	Satisfactory
1454	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	bsf-nea: 2013 landings and biological sampling data not submitted in time to WGDEEP data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	The WGDEEP is too soon in the year, it is practically impossible to meet any data requirement in the first quarter of the year. Few years ago the WGDEEP worked with n-2 years data and its date was not a problem. Suddenly the WG started to work with n-1 year data but the WG date still being very soon in the year. Spain has warned ICES about this many times in the last years and also requested ICES repeatedly that this WG needed to be delayed. Spain did not received any answer from ICES. Spanish WGDEEP data were sent after the deadline, but before the meeting.Â We have sent several official communications about this point. FIDES closes at 15th February and then it is necessary to extract the information.	If the data call request the MS to submit certain data then the MS should provide the data. The optimal timing should be discussed in another forum (e.g. WG). ICES should respond to the question raised by the MS.	Satisfactory
1471	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCEPH. EcoRegion: NA	Cephalopods: data not delivered in time: survey data 2013 England and Wales, Discard data Wales, ALL data from France	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Spanish data were submitted to the coordinator on time. This WG needs to clarify the data format and the Data call process.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1480	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	alf-comb: The general absence of data on species composition of the catches and biological parameters are important limiting factors for the knowledge of these fish stocks.	MEDIUM	QUALITY	The Spanish fleet operating in European waters is not targeting Beryx spp. The Spanish landings of these species are smaller than 200 tons by year, therefore Â Spain does not have to carry out biological sampling of its stocks according to the rules of the EC Decision 93/2010 (DCF regulation)	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1485	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCEPH. EcoRegion: NA	Cephalopods: There is still a data clarification request process to be deployed in relation to: a) Species (even family level!) identification in the catches and landings (northern countries and France) b) Discards: more biological data related to cephalopods (already being collected by some countries). c) Discard data: sampled level for discard for submission. All data should be raised.	MEDIUM	QUALITY	Discards estimation of these species have always been presented to this WG. The series includes information for the period 2003-2014. Discards have been raised to the levels requested by the WG. However, the high level of disaggregation requested in this WG may produce misreporting in estimation (overstratification).	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1518	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	gfb-comb: Although most of the countries reported data by species, landings in Subarea IX reported as Phycis spp. might include Phycis phycis	LOW	QUALITY	The Spanish 2014 gfc-comb data only corresponded to Phycis blennoides.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory



SWEDEN										
id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
126	RCM	2014	[ None ]	NS&EA: age and length data	the number of species in age and length samples in the RDB differed between before and after the extraction of sample records with no information from the RDB	UNKNOWN	QUALITY	The comment is not specific enough to give a proper answer.	Issue raised by the RCM NS&EA is unclear. It seems that problem rather lies in the RDB than on MS' side. In order to solve such detailed problems, a direct communication between RDB technical management and MS would be more appropriate.	Unknown
127	RCM	2014	[ None ]	NA: size data	no length measurements on eel ( <i>Anguilla anguilla</i> ) in reference years 2009, 2011 and 2013 and no single fish weight and length measurements in RY 2009-2013	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	Collected data is stored in a national database and delivered to WGEEL. The data was not uploaded to RDB since it has not been very clear and not used within the RCM. A datacall for salmon and eel was planned for 1 dec 2014 but was not fully realized. Sweden uploaded data for 2012 and 2013 and is working on getting all years uploaded.	MS reply is acceptable. This issue is not relevant for MS	Satisfactory
128	RCM	2014	[ None ]	Baltic: age data	no data on single fish age for eel ( <i>Anguilla anguilla</i> ) in reference years 2009-2013	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	Collected data is stored in a national database and delivered to WGEEL. The data was not uploaded to RDB since it has not been very clear and not used within the RCM. A datacall for salmon and eel was planned for 1 dec 2014 but was not fully realized. Sweden uploaded data for 2012 and 2013 and is working on getting all years uploaded.	MS answer is not acceptable. Requested data should be submitted	Unsatisfactory
129	RCM	2014	[ None ]	Baltic: size data	no length measurements on salmon ( <i>Salmo salar</i> ) in reference year 2012 and no single fish weight and length in RY 2009-2013	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	Collected data is stored in a national database and delivered to WGBAST. The data was not uploaded since it has not been very clear and not used within the RCM. A datacall for salmon and eel was planned for 1 dec 2014 but was not realized. Sweden is working on getting all data uploaded.	MS answer is not acceptable. MS should submit the requested data	Unsatisfactory
130	RCM	2014	[ None ]	Baltic: age data	no data on single fish age for salmon ( <i>Salmo salar</i> ) in reference years 2009-2013	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	Collected data is stored in a national database and delivered to WGBAST. The data was not uploaded since it has not been very clear and not used within the RCM. A datacall for salmon and eel was planned for 1 dec 2014 but was not realized. Sweden is working on getting data between 2009-2014 uploaded.	MS answer is not acceptable. Requested data should be submitted	Unsatisfactory
1051	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	fle-2732: Previous results (ICES, 2014c) indicate that landings in the recreational fishery are large enough to influence the flounder populations in this assessment unit. However, better estimates from the recreational fishery are needed, with respective estimates of uncertainty.	MEDIUM	QUALITY	In current DCF regulation Flounder is not included as a species to be sampled in recreational fisheries. This need for data might be dealt with in the future EU-MAP, especially if the datacollection will be more end-user driven.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1091	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: HAWG. EcoRegion: North Sea	her-3a22: Estimation of stock identity of herring from the transfer area in Division IVa East should be improved.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	The comment is relevant for the stock, however Sweden is only sampling in area 3a, since the landings in area IVaE is less than 3% of the whole Swedish catch of western Baltic and North Sea herring. Samples taken by Sweden for the stock separation is analysed by studying different spawning type in otoliths, which is a proper method for separation of the stocks.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1097	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: HAWG. EcoRegion: North Sea	her-47d3: ICES is concerned about the lack of information on unallocated removals in all herring fisheries; efforts should be made to maintain observer coverage across fleets that catch a substantial proportion of pelagic fish and to report on these issues. Introduction of the EU landing obligation may change this situation.	MEDIUM	COVERAGE	The discard of herring is considered negligible and therefore the landing obligation has not been considered to affect the fishing pattern in such way that action is planned for a change in sampling.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1116	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and migratory stocks	hke-nrth: Assessment data arrived after the ICES data call deadline, thus reducing time to review and audit the assessment results. Although the data were used, the delay may reduce ICES quality assurance.	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Landing and discard was uploaded to InterCatch 2014-09-04 (day before deadline). Sweden is not sampling biological information on hake, according to the NP.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1125	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and migratory stocks	hke-nrth: Only partial discards are included in the assessment and forecast. In order to reduce uncertainty in discard estimates, an increased sampling level for on-board observer programmes is needed for some fleets (non-Nephrops trawlers, gillnetters, and longliners).	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	The species is not included in Swedish NP.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1134	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and migratory stocks	hke-nrth: There is large uncertainty associated with the estimation of discards. Hake otoliths are currently collected but not used in the assessment due to lack of a validated ageing method. The utility of the current sampling and its level should be re-evaluated.	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN	The species is not included in Swedish NP due to low landings.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory

## SWEDEN

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1157	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and migratory stocks	hom-west: As in previous years, and despite the data sampling regulations for EU countries, some countries with major catches have not conducted biological sampling programmes.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	The species is not included in Swedish NP.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1166	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and migratory stocks	hom-west: Not all countries provide data on discards; consequently, there is no estimate of the total amount of discards in the horse mackerel fisheries.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	No Swedish fisheries on this species.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1186	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and migratory stocks	mac-nea: Limited sampling for discards has been carried out since 2000, despite a formal requirement initiated in the EU in 2002. Estimating the discarded and slipped proportions of catch is problematic in pelagic fisheries due to high variability in discard and slipping practices. In some fleets no sampling for discards is carried out, including those fleets for which discarding is illegal. The discards included in the catch in the assessment are an underestimate.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Sweden is not sampling the stock, according to the NP.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1279	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	ple-2123: No historical discard information prior to 2011 is available, but discards are considered to be significant.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Discard information from 2002-2013 was uploaded for the data compilation workshop in September 2014.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1284	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	ple-2432: Information on discards is limited and indicates that discarding is substantial, but the data are insufficient to estimate a discard proportion that could be applied to give catch advice.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	The major Swedish fishery in the Baltic is targeting cod and plaice is only a by-catch species. Therefore there is no clear relation between landings and discards.	MS answer is acceptable if discard information is collected and discard estimates provided.	Satisfactory
1385	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	tur-2232: Catch data, including discards, need to be improved to get a better understanding of the state of turbot in the Baltic Sea. Biological data would be required to distinguish stock components.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Swedish landings and discards are very low and therefore not included in NP. The stock is considered to be a data poor stock and needs to be handled according to the general approach discussed within ICES.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1497	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	cod-2532: Ageing discrepancies between countries have been recognised for a long time but the recent trend in growth rate may have increased the consequence of this problem.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	The issue has been dealt with in different fora for many years with higher intensity during 2014/15 (eg. WKBALTCOD). Sweden is actively taking part in the process to improve the stock assessment of cod.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1505	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBFAS. EcoRegion: Baltic Sea	cod-2532: Removals of cod in recreational fisheries in the Baltic Sea are currently neither consistently nor completely sampled.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Sampling of recreational fishery of cod in Swedish waters are undertaken in the Sound. The ICES WGRFS is the expert group to advice of improvement in the sampling of cod in which Sweden also take part in.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1019	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	cod-347d: The Danish REX, UK northeast coast, and UK whitefish surveys have all been discontinued due to lack of funding. Such surveys require sustained support for at least five years in order for their outputs to be considered for inclusion in stock assessments as time-series indices.	MEDIUM	QUALITY	The issue is not relevant for Sweden.Å	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1027	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	cod-347d: Unaccounted removals are no longer estimated for 2006 onwards. The main sources of uncertainty are aspects of the input data (historical landings and discards; discrepancies between stock trends implied by the age structure of the commercial catch and surveys) and the assumption of fishing mortality and recruitment in the advice forecast. SSB has been overestimated in previous years.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	The Swedish catch of cod in the area is rather low and therefore the contribution of the Swedish data is of minor impact on the stock.Å According to the WGNSSK, the level of unallocated landings, discards and highgrading has been assumed to be low.Å	MS answer is acceptable. Such very general statement from the WG is very difficult to comment on in relation to a specific country. Agreed coordinated actions must be implemented through future data calls. This type of issue has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1049	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	dab-nsea: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	Uploaded to InterCatch 2014-03-28 (Same date as deadline)	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory

## SWEDEN

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1055	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	fle-nsea: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	Uploaded to InterCatch 2014-03-28 (Same date as deadline)	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1071	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	gug-347d: Species misidentification continues to be a major problem in estimating the landings of all gurnards and hence grey gurnard. In addition, discarding is estimated to be high	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	In general, Sweden is not landing gurnards (1,5 tonnes 2013) and there are approximately only two species caught. The amount of discard was estimated to be 30 tonnes.	MS answer is acceptable. Such very general statement from the WG is very difficult to comment on in relation to a specific country. Agreed coordinated actions must be implemented through future data calls. This type of issue has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1083	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	had-34/had-346a: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	Uploaded to InterCatch 2014-03-28 (Same date as deadline)	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1179	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	lin-oth: 2013 landing and discard not submitted in time to WGDEEP data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Uploaded to InterCatch 2014-03-28Å (Same date as deadline).	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1216	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGMIXFISH-ADVICE. EcoRegion: North Sea	mix-fish: Mixed-fisheries analysis and projections critically rely on data being available on time to allow sufficient quality checking and preparation. Some data were submitted only shortly before the meeting, which limited the possibilities for additional data investigations.	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	The data asked for is not specific. Sweden uploadedÅ data on landings and discards to Inter catch before the deadline. The additional information asked for by the WG was delivered in time (in csv files)!	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1235	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	nep-10-Nov (FU10), The time-series of UWTV survey data is incomplete and no survey has been conducted since 2007. There are no reliable effort data for this FU and therefore no resulting lpue.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Area FU 10 is not included in Swedish NP.	MS answer is acceptable. However, this is a general comment which should not have been sent out to all MS.	Satisfactory
1243	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	nep-3-4: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	Data delayed to 2014-03-31, due to quality checking. Delay discussed and accepted by stock coordinator (Mats Ulmestrand).	MS answer is acceptable but quality check should be posible before data call deadline (particularly when the receiver is in-house).	Satisfactory
1248	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	nep-32: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	Data delayed to 2014-03-31, due to quality checking. Delay discussed and accepted by stock coordinator (Mats Ulmestrand).	MS answer is acceptable but quality check should be posible before data call deadline (particularly when the receiver is in-house).	Satisfactory
1313	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	ple-skag: Data for discards are only available since 2012, hence the catch advice is based on the average of the last 2 years of catches.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Discard information from 2002-2013 was uploaded for the data compilation workshop in October 2014.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1336	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	rng-kask: 2013 discard not submitted in time to WGDEEP data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	Uploaded to InterCatch 2014-03-28 (Same dateÅ as deadline).	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1355	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	arg-oth: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGDEEP data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Uploaded to InterCatch 2014-03-28 (Same date as deadline).	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory

## SWEDEN

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1423	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	whg-kask: 2013 landings and discard not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day. No biological sampling data in InterCatch.	LOW	TIMELINESS	Uploaded to InterCatch 2014-03-28 (Same date as deadline). Sweden does not have any biological sampling of whiting according to NP.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1426	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	wit-nsea: 2013 landings, discard and biological sampling data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	Landings and discards uploaded to InterCatch 2014-03-28. Biological sampling data uploaded to benchmark.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1432	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and migratory stocks	bli-oth: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGDEEP data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Uploaded to InterCatch 2014-03-28 (Same date as deadline).	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1440	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	bll-nsea: 2013 landings and discard not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	Uploaded to InterCatch 2014-03-28 (Same date as deadline).	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1443	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	bll-nsea: Fishery-independent surveys catch very few large brill, creating data gaps for the greater fish lengths. Commercial surveys could be developed to effectively monitor the full age and size spectrum of this species.	MEDIUM	QUALITY	The issue needs to be discussed, designed and coordinated on a regional scale.	MS answer is acceptable. ICES comment is too general and should not be addressed as a data transmission failure. This type of issues has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1516	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	cod-347d: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	Uploaded to InterCatch 2014-03-28 (Same date as deadline).	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory

United-Kingdom

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
344	JRC	2014	Aquaculture		UK provided detailed cost structure for 2011 and 2012 and significantly improved data submission, however it has not been possible to calculate all economic indicators (e.g. net profit) on the segment level for 2011, as the data set was incomplete. Most of variables are missing for the years 2008-2010. The issue has been raised already in the past and it is unlikely that it could be solved retrospectively.	HIGH	UNKNOWN	There are long-established methods across all three administrative areas of the UK (Scotland, England & Wales, Northern Ireland) to gather data on aquaculture volumes of sales (by species), employment, and numbers of enterprises. Value (turnover) data is also collated for Regulation (EC) No 762/2008. These processes enable submission of high quality data on these variables under Regulation (EC) No 199/2008 (DCF). However, DCF requires additional data (subsidies; other income; costs for personnel, energy, livestock, feed, repair and maintenance, other operational costs, depreciation of capital, finance, extraordinary costs; value of assets, investments, debt; input volumes of livestock and feed) which had not been routinely collected. The gap was recognised and an additional survey of aquaculture enterprises was trialled (via a consultancy firm) to collect and collate this additional data for 2011; the process was repeated for 2012. The survey approach is being further refined for 2013 data, and the data collection and collation has transferred to Cefas. The initiation and refinement of the additional data collection and collation processes will improve the coverage and quality of submissions. Currently the additional data has not been collected for 2008-2010. Also, due to concerns with the segmented 2011 aquaculture enterprise survey results, generic aquaculture data (i.e. not segmented) was submitted, derived from a combination of aquaculture survey results, the UK's national business survey, and standard industry proportions. Retrospective estimation (to fill gaps for segments in 2011 and years 2008-2010) using subsequent years' data is considered to have little merit.	Clarification of MS aquaculture data collection issues and scenarios for improvement was provided comprehensively, considering repetitiveness of this issue and size of the sector. But failure of submission a large portion of information could not be justified or at least it can be finally assessed in EWG expert group using solutions from respective similar cases. Å	[ NOT ASSESSED ]
84	RCM	2014	[ None ]	NS&EA: comercial landings, effort and sampling	missing data on commercial landing and commercial effort for RY 2009 (Northern Ireland)	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	The 2012 Cephalopod data call (for data from 2009-2011) comprised in part a subset of the CE and CL files that were required in the regional database call in 2012, albeit the regional database call specified 2010-2011 data only. For UK purposes, the cephalopod data call meant downloading and processing data into the CE and CL files for each of 2009-2011 (even though the 2009 data were not specified in the regional database call) prior to populating the cephalopod workbooks. Because of this overlap between data calls, the CE and CL files for 2009-2011 were, in fact, all created and used to populate the regional database for 2009-2011 under the 2012 regional database data call. Each of those uploads resulted in a 'success' message flashed across the data import screen and we cannot be held responsible if, in some way, the data had not been successfully uploaded or had been subsequently deleted.	Issue to be investigated by DGMARE (MS states that data at least effort and landing date were submitted as requested, this can not be verified by EWG). The issue should be discussed and solved by bilateral communication between the MS and the RDB-FishFrame administration.	Unknown
85	RCM	2014	[ None ]	NS&EA:age and legth data	the number of species in age samples in the RDB differed between before and after the extraction of sample records with no information from the RDB (Northern Ireland)	UNKNOWN	QUALITY	This 'issue' reflects that Northern Ireland uploaded 4 samples with length distributions but not age information from 2013. It does not illustrate how many samples with length and age information were uploaded so that the frequency of length but no age data could be determined. If Northern Ireland has not uploaded those four sample length distributions, then the RCM would not have flagged a quality issue, so it appears the RCM is telling member States to only upload samples where length and age are collected and not where length only is collected. same as scotland row 82; query with alastair	Issue raised by the RCM NS&EA is unclear. It seems that problem rather lies in the RDB than on MS' side. In order to solve such detailed problems, a direct communication between RDB technical management and MS would be more appropriate.	Unknown
131	ICCAT	2014	[ None ]	T1NC: Nominal Catches	questionable data quality for all gear groups	LOW	QUALITY	ICCAT have had the data for nearly a year and no quality issues have previously been raised by the data provider. Clearer information on the problem identified is needed to allow a response.	MS answer can be considered acceptable. Moreover, end user should provide concrete examples illustrating why data quality is considered questionable for all gear groups in order to facilitate the assessment of this issue as requested by MS. The end user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies	Satisfactory
132	ICCAT	2014	[ None ]	T2SW/CAS: Catch-at size	no data on large tuna species and sharks (various fleets)	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	Further investigation needed into missing data.	The explanation given by MS is not acceptable. MS should investigate this issue and should submit the requested data	Unsatisfactory
133	RCM	2014	[ None ]	NS&EA: comercial landings, effort and sampling	missing data on commercial landings and commercial effort for RY 2009 (England)	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	See response - Comment ID 84	Issue to be investigated by DGMARE (MS states that data at least effort and landing date were submitted as requested, this can not be verified by EWG). The issue should be discussed and solved by bilateral communication between the MS and the RDB-FishFrame administration.	Unknown



United-Kingdom

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
134	RCM	2014	[ None ]	NS&EA: comercial landings, effort and sampling	missing data on commercial landings and commercial effort for RY 2009 (Scotland)	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	See response - Comment ID 84	Issue to be investigated by DGMARE (MS states that data at least effort and landing date were submitted as requested, this can not be verified by EWG). The issue should be discussed and solved by bilateral communication between the MS and the RDB-FishFrame administration.	Unknown
135	RCM	2014	[ None ]	NS&EA: comercial landings, effort and sampling	missing data on commercial landings and commercial effort for RY 2009-2013 and commercial samplings in 2013	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	See response in row 2 - Comment ID 84	Issue to be investigated by DGMARE (MS states that data at least effort and landing date were submitted as requested, this can not be verified by EWG). The issue should be discussed and solved by bilateral communication between the MS and the RDB-FishFrame administration.	Unknown
136	RCM	2014	[ None ]	NS&EA: comercial landings, effort and sampling	missing data on commercial landing for RY 2009 and for commercial samplings for RY 2009-2011 (Wales)	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	See response - Comment ID 84	Issue to be investigated by DGMARE (MS states that data at least effort and landing date were submitted as requested, this can not be verified by EWG). The issue should be discussed and solved by bilateral communication between the MS and the RDB-FishFrame administration.	Unknown
137	RCM	2014	[ None ]	NS&EA:age and legth data	the number of species in age samples in the RDB differed between before and after the extraction of sample records with no information from the RDB (England)	UNKNOWN	QUALITY	The RCM report does not make clear as to what this signifies. The report states: "During the RCM meeting, some verifications were realized and the records in the age samples with no age information but only length information were identified as data in the results of the number of species in the age samples". In other words, for some species, age records seem only to comprise length records. The problem is that the RDB upload routines should flag this as an error so that the input file can be corrected. As things stand, this issue only became apparent on testing within the database and required the extraction routines to be modified in order to illustrate the problem (and access to those routines is limited).	Issue raised by the RCM NS&EA is unclear. It seems that problem rather lies in the RDB than on MS' side. In order to solve such detailed problems, a direct communication between RDB technical management and MS would be more appropriate.	Unknown
138	RCM	2014	[ None ]	NS&EA:age and legth data	the number of species in age and length samples in the RDB differed between before and after the extraction of sample records with no information from the RDB (Scotland)	UNKNOWN	QUALITY	The RCM report does not make clear as to what this signifies. The report states: "During the RCM meeting, some verifications were realized and the records in the age samples with no age information but only length information were identified as data in the results of the number of species in the age samples". In other words, for some species, age records seem only to comprise length records. The problem is that the RDB upload routines should flag this as an error so that the input file can be corrected. As things stand, this issue only became apparent on testing within the database and required the extraction routines to be modified in order to illustrate the problem (and access to those routines is limited).	Issue raised by the RCM NS&EA is unclear. It seems that problem rather lies in the RDB than on MS' side. In order to solve such detailed problems, a direct communication between RDB technical management and MS would be more appropriate.	Unknown
139	RCM	2014	[ None ]	NA: size data	missing length data (37% less measuremnts than in AR)	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	The current RDB structure does not allow all UK sample data to be uploaded yet and there is no process for recording data that could not be uploaded. The RCM recommended a process which will improve on this.	Assuming that the sampling procedure is in agreement with the DCF, the MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
140	RCM	2014	[ None ]	NA: age data	HKE ages not uploaded	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	Hake is currently assessed with length based data only and that there is currently no plan to move back to age in the medium term as there is no method available to age hake.	Issue to be investigated by DGMARE, all MSs participating in RCM, and the end user	Unknown
141	DG MARE	2014	[ None ]	Seabass/Effort	Gear codes did not match gear codes by metiers. (i.e. pelagic_trawl <-> OTM, PTM) gear metiers used	MEDIUM	QUALITY	we believe this comment relates to the fact that in the UK the OTM and PTM gears are frequently used as a demersal trawl â€” e.g. the Irish Sea demersal fisheries. This is a long standing issue that has affected using a simple read-across of OTM and PTM to a pelagic gear coding in a range of work related to data calls across the past decade. As such rather than submit misleading information the activity is using PTM/OTM is classified according to catch composition â€” this has been essential to ensure that the demersal activity is correctly recorded in sensitive areas like the Irish Sea. This issue was communicated to the Commission and the submission of data included an extra column to include the details of OTM and PTM used as pelagic trawls.	MS answer is acceptable even though Sub group do not understand the MS comment above which probably is mixing the terms "demersal" and "pelagic" (" simple read-across of OTM and PTM to a pelagic gear coding" and " extra column to include the details of OTM and PTM used as pelagic trawls"). This is the pragmatic solution on an everlasting problem.	Satisfactory

United-Kingdom

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
142	IOTC	2014	[ None ]	size data	no data submitted	UNKNOWN	COVERAGE	All was landed abroad into South Africa and Mauritius .	MS should investigate a solution (e.g. self-sampling) in order to overcome this problem for the future.	Unsatisfactory
378	JRC	2014	Effort		UK (SCO) - re-submission of data less than one week before second EWG.	HIGH	QUALITY	It is only to be expected that Member States will revise data if an error is found in previously submitted information. The consequence of penalising a Member State for making revisions would be alarming as such actions would comprise a powerful incentive to avoid reporting and correcting errors.	MS has to take appropriate measures to prepare and provide data in due time	Unsatisfactory
1076	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	gug-89a: The data for catches of grey gurnard are considered highly unreliable. Catch statistics are incomplete and are often not separated by species.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Please! Specify the failing, if any, that the UK is supposed to have made in regard to the collection of data compared with its national programme or in regard to any alleged failing to transmit data.	Not relevant to the UK	Satisfactory
1096	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: HAWG. EcoRegion: North Sea	her-47d3: ICES is concerned about the lack of information on unallocated removals in all herring fisheries; efforts should be made to maintain observer coverage across fleets that catch a substantial proportion of pelagic fish and to report on these issues. Introduction of the EU landing obligation may change this situation. Applies to UK-SCO, UK-EW, UK-NI	MEDIUM	COVERAGE	Marine Scotland cut its pelagic observer programme mid 2011. Attention is drawn to the fact that Marine Scotland referred explicitly to this issue in its revision to the UK National Proposals for 2012 et seq. The European Commission did not request further explanation on this matter in its correspondence with the Member State when reflecting the UK national proposals for 2012 et seq. Consequently there is no obligation to collect the data referred to here under the 2013 or any of the 'roll-over' programmes.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1105	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	her-noss: While discarding in the fisheries of this stock is considered to be low, slippage occurs. The amount of slippage is unquantified and thus cannot be accounted for in the assessment.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Account will be taken of this issue in the national plans put forward for implementation of the landings obligation.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1115	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	hke-nrth: Assessment data arrived after the ICES data call deadline, thus reducing time to review and audit the assessment results. Although the data were used, the delay may reduce ICES quality assurance.	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	UK-SCO: Marine Scotland Science data were delayed as they were in late receipt of fishing effort data. This information was relayed to, and accepted by, expert group members and stock coordinators via the expert group's 'google group' conversation. Moreover, it was known that a number of the stock coordinators were themselves unable to make use of the data prior to the expert group meeting. CEFAS (England) data were supplied on time.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1124	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	hke-nrth: Only partial discards are included in the assessment and forecast. In order to reduce uncertainty in discard estimates, an increased sampling level for on-board observer programmes is needed for some fleets (non-Nephrops trawlers, gillnetters, and longliners).	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This 'issue' is another example of the sort of comment that would previously have been directed to the ICES PGCCDBS as it does not detail a failure against a Member State's agreed national programme or a failure thereafter to transmit data collected under a national programme. This should be addressed by RCMS as part of regionally-coordinated sampling schemes, to identify data gaps that are likely to have high leverage in assessments and advice, and propose feasible adjustments to programmes.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory

United-Kingdom

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1133	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	hke-nrth: There is large uncertainty associated with the estimation of discards. Hake otoliths are currently collected but not used in the assessment due to lack of a validated ageing method. The utility of the current sampling and its level should be re-evaluated.	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN	This 'issue' is another example of the sort of comment that would previously have been directed to the ICES PGCCDBS as it does not detail a failure against a Member State's agreed national programme. MS answer is acceptable. or a failure thereafter to transmit data collected under a national programme.		Satisfactory
1150	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	hom-nsea: When considering the potential mixing of Western and North Sea horse mackerel in Division VllD, better information on the biological origin of catches from that area would greatly improve the quality of future scientific advice and, consequently, management of the North Sea horse mackerel stock. applies to UK-EW, UK-SCO	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This is a wish-list of 'would like to haves' and not a specified list of failings to collect data compared to agreed national programmes or failures to transmit data once collected. This would require a stock identification project which is not covered by DCF.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1156	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	hom-west: As in previous years, and despite the data sampling regulations for EU countries, some countries with major catches have not conducted biological sampling programmes.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Please! Specify the failing, if any, that the UK is supposed to have made in regard to the collection of data compared with its national programme or in regard to any alleged failing to transmit data. This should be addressed by RCMs as part of regionally-coordinated sampling schemes, to identify data gaps that are likely to have high leverage in assessments and advice, and propose feasible adjustments to programmes.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1165	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	hom-west: Not all countries provide data on discards; consequently, there is no estimate of the total amount of discards in the horse mackerel fisheries. Applies to UK-EW, UK-SCO, UK-NI	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Marine Scotland cut its pelagic observer programme mid 2011. Attention is drawn to the fact that Marine Scotland referred explicitly to this issue in its revision to the UK National Proposals for 2012 et seq. The European Commission did not request further explanation on this matter in its correspondence with the Member State when reflecting the UK national proposals for 2012 et seq. Consequently there is no obligation to collect the data referred to here under the 2013 or any of the 'roll-over' programmes. Again, this should be addressed by RCMs as part of regionally-coordinated sampling schemes, to identify data gaps that are likely to have high leverage in assessments and advice, and propose feasible adjustments to programmes.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1185	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	mac-nea: Limited sampling for discards has been carried out since 2000, despite a formal requirement initiated in the EU in 2002. Estimating the discarded and slipped proportions of catch is problematic in pelagic fisheries due to high variability in discard and slipping practices. In some fleets no sampling for discards is carried out, including those fleets for which discarding is illegal. The discards included in the catch in the assessment are an underestimate. Applies to Guernsey, Jersey, UK-IOM, UK-SCO, UK-EW, UK-NI	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Marine Scotland cut its pelagic observer programme mid 2011. Attention is drawn to the fact that Marine Scotland referred explicitly to this issue in its revision to the UK National Proposals for 2012 et seq. The European Commission did not request further explanation on this matter in its correspondence with the Member State when reflecting the UK national proposals for 2012 et seq. Consequently there is no obligation to collect the data referred to here under the 2013 or any of the 'roll-over' programmes.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1229	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	mur-west: Regular biological sampling of striped red mullet catches is expected to continue under the EU Data Collection Framework, but the frequency is currently insufficient to calculate catch-at-age outside the Bay of Biscay and Divisions VIIeIX–h.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	The IV/VIIId/IIIa assessment is based on survey biomass trends, not analytical catch-at-age assessments. WGWIDE should consider if it would be better to explore more robust data-limited assessments and associated harvest control rules, and how to fit this with mixed fishery management, before trying to initiate more age-based fishery sampling. This 'issue' is another example of the sort of MS answer is acceptable. comment that would previously have been directed to the ICES PGCCDBS as it does not detail a failure against a Member State's agreed national programme or a failure thereafter to transmit data collected under a national programme.		Satisfactory

United-Kingdom

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1449	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGWIDE. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	boc-nea: boarfish is not currently included under the EU Data Collection Framework. A comprehensive and coordinated sampling scheme and a continuation of the targeted acoustic survey are needed to provide the scientific basis for advice on this species.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	It is not enough to ask for a "comprehensive" sampling scheme, without considering how the data will be used, what precision is needed, and how much does it cost. Boarfish are monitored mainly by acoustic surveys, but ICES wants to move away from use of a production model to something age based. An Expert Group should review what the most cost-effective options are for assessment/management in future, and RCMs should consider this in relation to existing national sampling schemes and regional coordination. This 'issue' is another example of the sort of comment that would previously have been directed to the ICES PGCCDBS as it does not detail a failure against a Member State's agreed national programme or a failure thereafter to transmit data collected under a national programme. ICES needs to ensure it has an extant expert group to whom these sorts of comments could be directed rather than assuming them to be failures to fulfil a Member State's agreed DCF programme.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1458	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	bss-8ab: Historical sampling of the commercial catches is of variable quality and data sampling should cover all fleets involved in this fishery. Time-series of relative abundance indices are needed for both the adult and pre-recruit components of the stock	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This is an issue for France mainly. This 'issue' is another example of the sort of comment that would previously have been directed to the ICES PGCCDBS as it does not detail a failure against a Member State's agreed national programme or a failure thereafter to transmit data collected under a national programme. ICES needs to ensure it has an extant expert group to whom these sorts of comments could be directed rather than assuming them to be failures to fulfil a Member State's agreed DCF programme.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1462	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGBIE. EcoRegion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	bss-8ab: Recreational fisheries are likely to contribute substantially to fishery removals in some areas. Time-series of catches, releases, and size/age composition are needed from this component of the fishery to improve the assessment and advice.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	France has some years of data and would be responsible for future such work. This 'issue' is another example of the sort of comment that would previously have been directed to the ICES PGCCDBS as it does not detail a failure against a Member State's agreed national programme or a failure thereafter to transmit data collected under a national programme. ICES needs to ensure it has an extant expert group to whom these sorts of comments could be directed rather than assuming them to be failures to fulfil a Member State's agreed DCF programme.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1017	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	cod-347d: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but until workshop day. Applies to UK-EW and UK-SCO	LOW	TIMELINESS	UK-SCO: Marine Scotland Science data were delayed as they were in late receipt of fishing effort data. This information was relayed to, and accepted by, expert group members and stock coordinators via the expert group's 'google group' conversation. Moreover, it was known that a number of the stock coordinators were themselves unable to make use of the data prior to the expert group meeting.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1018	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	cod-347d: The Danish REX, UK northeast coast, and UK whitefish surveys have all been discontinued due to lack of funding. Such surveys require sustained support for at least five years in order for their outputs to be considered for inclusion in stock assessments as time-series indices.	MEDIUM	QUALITY	The UK NE coast and whitefish surveys were Fishery Science Partnership projects of limited duration, not funded by DCF and provided as supporting information. The only benchmarked and agreed survey MS answer is acceptable.		Satisfactory
1026	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	cod-347d: Unaccounted removals are no longer estimated for 2006 onwards. The main sources of uncertainty are aspects of the input data (historical landings and discards; discrepancies between stock trends implied by the age structure of the commercial catch and surveys) and the assumption of fishing mortality and recruitment in the advice forecast. SSB has been overestimated in previous years.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Please! Specify the failing, if any, that the UK is supposed to have made in regard to the collection of data compared with its national programme or in regard to any alleged failing to transmit data.	MS answer is acceptable. Such very general statement from the WG is very difficult to comment on in relation to a specific country. Agreed coordinated actions must be implemented through future data calls. This type of issue has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory

## United-Kingdom

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1046	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	dab-nea: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	UK-Sco: Marine Scotland Science data were delayed as they were in late receipt of fishing effort data. This information was relayed to, and accepted by, expert group members and stock coordinators via the expert group's 'google group' conversation. Moreover, it was known that a number of the stock coordinators were themselves unable to make use of the data prior to the expert group meeting. UKE had a number of problems uploading data to the system. Upload completed on 28/03/2014 - deadline.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1058	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	fle-nsea: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but until workshop day. Applies to UK-SCO	LOW	TIMELINESS	UK-Sco: Marine Scotland Science data were delayed as they were in late receipt of fishing effort data. This information was relayed to, and accepted by, expert group members and stock coordinators via the expert group's 'google group' conversation. Moreover, it was known that a number of the stock coordinators were themselves unable to make use of the data prior to the expert group meeting.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1059	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	fle-nsea: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but until workshop day. Applies to UK-EW	LOW	TIMELINESS	UKE - had problems uploading data to the system. Upload completed on 28/03/2014 - deadline.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1060	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	fle-nsea: Landings data are not complete before 1998, and are probably not indicative of catches. Discards should be estimated and added to the landings.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	There is no obligation under the DCF to provide data collected before 2009 - see Commission letter "Access to data on fisheries collected by Member States under the Data Collection Framework" from Veronika Veits, Commission reference: 27.04.2010 D 04789	MS answer is acceptable. Such very general statement from the WG is very difficult to comment on in relation to a specific country. Agreed coordinated actions must be implemented through future data calls. This type of issue has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1065	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	fle-nsea: The mixed TAC with dab reduces the accuracy of catch statistics per species. International sampling effort for this species is at a very low level as only the Netherlands is collecting data. An increase in sampling intensity should be considered.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Please! Specify the failing, if any, that the UK is supposed to have made in regard to the collection of data compared with its national programme or in regard to any alleged failing to transmit data.	MS answer is acceptable. Such very general statement from the WG is very difficult to comment on in relation to a specific country. Agreed coordinated actions must be implemented through future data calls. This type of issue has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1070	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	gug-347d: Species misidentification continues to be a major problem in estimating the landings of all gurnards and hence grey gurnard. In addition, discarding is estimated to be high	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Please! Specify the failing, if any, that the UK is supposed to have made in regard to the collection of data compared with its national programme or in regard to any alleged failing to transmit data.	MS answer is acceptable. Such very general statement from the WG is very difficult to comment on in relation to a specific country. Agreed coordinated actions must be implemented through future data calls. This type of issue has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory



## United-Kingdom

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1085	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	had-34/had-346a: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	UK-SCO: Marine Scotland Science data were delayed as they were in late receipt of fishing effort data. This information was relayed to, and accepted by, expert group members and stock coordinators via the expert group's 'google group' conversation. Moreover, it was known that a number of the stock coordinators were themselves unable to make use of the data prior to the expert group meeting. UKE had problems uploading data to the system. Upload completed on 28/03/2014 - deadline.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1087	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCSE. EcoRegion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland	had-7b-k: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGCSE data call submission deadline, but until workshop day	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	UK-SCO: Marine Scotland Science data were delayed as they were in late receipt of fishing effort data. This information was relayed to, and accepted by, expert group members and stock coordinators via the expert group's 'google group' conversation. Moreover, it was known that a number of the stock coordinators were themselves unable to make use of the data prior to the expert group meeting. UKE had problems uploading data to the system. Upload completed on 28/03/2014 - deadline.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1095	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCSE. EcoRegion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland	ang-ivi: 2013 landings and length compositions of landings not submitted in time to WGCSE data call submission deadline, but until workshop day. Applies to UK-SCO	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	UK-SCO: Marine Scotland Science data were delayed as they were in late receipt of fishing effort data. The stock coordinator/assessor for this stock was the person responsible for the submission of these data and self-certified that, for workshop purposes, she did not require them until the first day of the workshop.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1104	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCSE. EcoRegion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland	her-nirs: The acoustic survey data are uncertain and the timing of the survey is occasionally mismatched with the migration pattern of the spawning-stock biomass. Applies to UK-NI	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This is an inherent problem in any surveys targeting population components that are ephemeral - e.g. spawning aggregations, eggs, larvae. It introduces year-effects that are ideally random. UK-NI conducts additional survey work, not DCF funded, using commercial vessels to survey the spawning grounds before and after the research vessel survey to examine timing of spawning migrations relative to the survey.	This type of issues has nothing to do with the actual data call.	Satisfactory
1111	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCSE. EcoRegion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland	her-vian: Samples from all quarters where there is fishing activity would improve allocation of sampled miz½tiers in the stock-raising process. The catch was well sampled in quarters 3 and 4 in 2013; however, 6% of the catch was taken in quarter 1 and no samples were taken in this quarter.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	94% of the landings were sampled and the sampling scheme was in accord with the national proposals. This 'issue' is another example of the sort of comment that would previously have been directed to the ICES PGCCDBS as it does not detail a failure against a Member State's agreed national programme or a failure thereafter to transmit data collected under a national programme. ICES needs to ensure it has an extant expert group to whom these sorts of comments could be directed rather than assuming them to be failures to fulfil a Member State's agreed DCF programme.	MS answer is acceptable. This type of issues has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1142	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCSE. EcoRegion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland	ang-ivi: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGCSE data call submission deadline, but until workshop day - discard, and biological sampling data on landings and discrad missing. Applies to UK-NI	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	UK-NI: Only landings data are submitted for this stock. There was an oversight for this stock in the extraction routine at the data call. This was only queried during the first day of the workshop and could thus not have been supplied earlier	MS answer is acceptable.	Unsatisfactory

United-Kingdom

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1175	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	lem-nsea: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but until workshop day. Applies to UK-EW and UK-SCO	LOW	TIMELINESS	UK-SCO: Marine Scotland Science data were delayed as they were in late receipt of fishing effort data. This information was relayed to, and accepted by, expert group members and stock coordinators via the expert group's 'google group' conversation. Moreover, it was known that a number of the stock coordinators were themselves unable to make use of the data prior to the expert group meeting. UKE had successive trouble uploading data to the system. Upload completed on 28/03/2014 - deadline.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1181	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	lin-oth: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGDEEP data call submission deadline, but until workshop day. Applies to UK-SCO	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	UK-SCO: Marine Scotland Science data were delayed as they were in late receipt of fishing effort data. This information was relayed to the expert group chair and was outside their control	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1206	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCSE. EcoRegion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland	mgw-78: Assessment data arrived after the ICES data call deadline, thus reducing time to review and audit the assessment results.	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	UKE - Upload completed on 17/04/2014 - deadline.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1215	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGMIXFISH-ADVICE. EcoRegion: North Sea	mix-fish: Mixed-fisheries analysis and projections critically rely on data being available on time to allow sufficient quality checking and preparation. Some data were submitted only shortly before the meeting, which limited the possibilities for additional data investigations.	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	UK-SCO: In common with data for the other ICES demersal assessment groups groups, Marine Scotland Science data were delayed as they were in late receipt of fishing effort data. This information was relayed to the expert group chair and was outside their control. UKE - Upload completed on 17/04/2014 - deadline. There hasn't been any requirement in the past to provide nil responses or a 'no data' response.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1226	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	mur-347d: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but until workshop day. Applies to UK-EW	LOW	TIMELINESS	UKE - had successive trouble uploading data to the system. Upload completed on 28/03/2014 - deadline.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1228	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	mur-347d: 2013 landings not submitted to 1st workgroup day. Applies to UK-SCO	LOW	TIMELINESS	UK-SCO: Marine Scotland Science data were delayed as they were in late receipt of fishing effort data. This information was relayed to, and accepted by, expert group members and stock coordinators via the expert group's 'google group' conversation. Moreover, it was known that a number of the stock coordinators were themselves unable to make use of the data prior to the expert group meeting.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1234	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	nep-10-Nov (FU10), The time-series of UWTV survey data is incomplete and no survey has been conducted since 2007. There are no reliable effort data for this FU and therefore no resulting lpue.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Lack of reliable effort data for a meaningful lpue is due to non-mandatory reporting of hours fished on EU logsheets / e-logs. Total landings from nep-10 were 15 tonnes in 2013 which is around 0.1 % of the total N Sea landings of Nephrops - a very unimportant stock. The DCF does not mandate a survey for this FU and there is no non-DCF survey.	MS answer is acceptable. However, this is a general comment which should not have been sent out to all MS.	Satisfactory

United-Kingdom

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1254	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	nep-33 (FU33): Assessment data are sparse for this FU. As catches from the Danish fisheries after 2005 only account for a small proportion of the catch, lpu figures from the Danish fisheries after 2005 must be viewed cautiously as stock indicators. Applies to UK-EWNI, UK-Sco	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This does not apply to the UK. UK landings are < 0.5 % of the total from this FU (2 tonnes). UK has a derogation not to sample due to low landings.	MS answer is acceptable. This is not a data transmission issue and should not have been sent out to all MS.	Satisfactory
1259	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	nep-34 (FU34): No survey information is available for 2013, which makes it impossible to provide an analytical assessment for this stock at the present time. Applies to UK-EWNI, UK-Sco.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Neither the DCF nor the agreed UK national programme mandates a survey of this FU. This 'issue' is another example of the sort of comment that would previously have been directed to the ICES PGCCDBS as it does not detail a failure against a Member State's agreed national programme or a failure thereafter to transmit data collected under a national programme.	MS answer is acceptable. This type of issues has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1261	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	nep-34 FU34, The time-series of UWTV survey data is incomplete. Surveys were conducted in 2003, 2005, and 2009%-2012. Applies to UK-EWNI, UK-Sco	LOW	QUALITY	Neither the DCF nor the agreed UK national programme mandates a survey of this FU. This 'issue' is another example of the sort of comment that would previously have been directed to the ICES PGCCDBS as it does not detail a failure against a Member State's agreed national programme or a failure thereafter to transmit data collected under a national programme.	MS answer is acceptable. This type of issues has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1265	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	nep-6 (FU6): Market sampling misses portions of the tailed category of landings which tend to be smaller individuals; the market sampling data may thus be biased towards larger sizes.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	Market sampling might miss portions of the tailed category but not knowingly. If any category or grade is missing from a landing when sampling then a sample is not taken. Our sampling procedures is dependent on all components of a landing being available for us to collect a valid sample. The tailed component of a landing can go to a different outlet or might not be available at the same time as the rest of the landing. Not all vessels land tails and if, as a consequence of the tails not being available from some vessels, the sampling tends to those vessels where "tailing" did not occur then there is the potential for bias. Sampling of this stock is under review.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1266	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCSE. EcoRegion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland	nep-VII-FU16: Discard observer coverage is low and should be increased, to better sample the landings and any discards that might be occurring.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This 'issue' is another example of the sort of comment that would previously have been directed to the ICES PGCCDBS as it does not detail a failure against a Member State's agreed national programme or a failure thereafter to transmit data collected under a national programme. In fact the UK's accepted national programme lists a derogation for sampling this stock attributable to a proposed bilateral agreement with Spain. ICES needs to ensure it has an extant expert group to whom these sorts of comments could be directed rather than assuming them to be failures to fulfil a Member State's agreed DCF programme.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1269	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	ory-comb: the stock recovery cannot be monitored with current monitoring data. Applies to UK-EW, UK-Sco.	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This 'issue' is another example of the sort of comment that would previously have been directed to the ICES PGCCDBS as it does not detail a failure against a Member State's agreed national programme or a failure thereafter to transmit data collected under a national programme. ICES needs to ensure it has an extant expert group to whom these sorts of comments could be directed rather than assuming them to be failures to fulfil a Member State's agreed DCF programme.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1288	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCSE. EcoRegion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland	ple-7h-k: The assessment is carried out on the landings in Divisions VIJk and there is no information other than landings from the component in Division VIIh of the TAC area. ICES is unable to assess stock trends in Division VIIh.	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	UKE - this has nothing to do with timeliness and we had no other data to transmit	MS answer is acceptable. NP is not specified on labs and Sub-divisions.	Satisfactory

United-Kingdom

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1291	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCSE. EcoRegion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland	ple-7h-k: The assessment is only based on age 4 and older; ICES does not have reliable information on younger ages. Applies to , UK-EW	LOW	TIMELINESS	UKE - quality rather than timeliness issue. The UK supplies data on the age classes occurring in the catches.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1305	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	ple-eche: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day. Applies to UK-EW	LOW	TIMELINESS	UKE - had successive trouble uploading data to the system. Upload completed on 28/03/2014 - deadline.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1312	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	ple-nsea: 2013 landings and discard not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day. Biological sampling data missing. Applies to UK-EW and UK-SCO	LOW	TIMELINESS	UK-SCO: Marine Scotland Science data were delayed as they were in late receipt of fishing effort data. This information was relayed to, and accepted by, expert group members and stock coordinators via the expert group's 'google group' conversation. Moreover, it was known that a number of the stock coordinators were themselves unable to make use of the data prior to the expert group meeting. UKE had successive trouble uploading data to the system. Upload completed on 28/03/2014 - deadline.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1322	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	pol-nsea: ICES now considers that discards are known to take place, but can only be quantified for part of the landings.	MEDIUM	QUALITY	The UK carries out randomised sampling of fleets in the North Sea that potentially can catch pollack, as part of its agreed DCF programme. Any discarding of pollack by the fleets covered would be recorded. This 'issue' is another example of the sort of comment that would previously have been directed to the ICES PGCCDBS as it does not detail a failure against a Member State's agreed national programme or a failure thereafter to transmit data collected under a national programme. ICES needs to ensure it has an extant expert group to whom these sorts of comments could be directed rather than assuming them to be failures to fulfil a Member State's agreed DCF programme.	ICES comment is too general. MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1326	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	rng-50b/: The current assessment method does not use catches from Division XIIb. Exploratory assessments were carried out using these data but are not yet considered to be reliable for advice. Fishing activity in Division XIIb currently may contribute to around 30% of the catch. The actual level of catch has been considered uncertain for several years because of problems with species reporting and misreporting to/from other areas. As this issue strongly impacts the quality of the assessment, it is necessary that	HIGH	QUALITY	This appears to be a problem of species and area misreporting. This 'issue' is another example of the sort of comment that would previously have been directed to the ICES PGCCDBS as it does not detail a failure against a Member State's agreed national programme or a failure thereafter to transmit data collected under a national programme. ICES needs to ensure it has an extant expert group to whom these sorts of comments could be directed rather than assuming them to be failures to fulfil a Member State's agreed DCF programme.	MS answer is acceptable. This type of issues has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1337	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	rng-0th: This assessment unit consists of a number of discrete areas in which only very small catches of roundnose grenadier occur. Improvement of the advice for the stock will require regular data collection by observers on board commercial vessels. The required information must contain data on gear type, length%–age composition, maturation and feeding of the species, spatial distribution, as well as size and composition of catches, effort, and discards. This information should be presented to ICES annually. Applies to UK-EW, UK-SCO.	LOW	QUALITY	ICES states that "Catches across this assessment unit are minor and have declined to very low levels in recent years. This is a bycatch fishery so trends in landings may reflect changes in activity in other fisheries rather than stock abundance." Landings are currently 100t or less - tiny compared to grenadier catches in other areas. Costs of data collection such as maturity, feeding would be very high. ICES must consider that we cannot sample everything in the ocean, and avoid making unrealistic requests for data without an associated costs-benefits analysis and consideration of feasibility. This 'issue' is another example of the sort of comment that would previously have been directed to the ICES PGCCDBS as it does not detail a failure against a Member State's agreed national programme or a failure thereafter to transmit data collected under a national programme. ICES needs to ensure it has an extant expert group to whom these sorts of comments could be directed rather than assuming them to be failures to fulfil a Member State's agreed DCF programme.	MS answer is acceptable. This type of issues has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory

United-Kingdom

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1344	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	rng-rest: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGDEEP data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day. Applies to UK-SCO	LOW	TIMELINESS	UK-SCO: Marine Scotland Science data were delayed as they were in late receipt of fishing effort data. This information was relayed to the expert group chair and was outside their control	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1348	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	rng-soth: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGDEEP data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day. Applies to UK-SCO	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	UK-SCO: Marine Scotland Science data were delayed as they were in late receipt of fishing effort data. This information was relayed to the expert group chair and was outside their control	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1351	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	sai-3a46: 2013 landings, discard and biological sampling data of landings and discard not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	UK-SCO: Marine Scotland Science data were delayed as they were in late receipt of fishing effort data. This information was relayed to, and accepted by, expert group members and stock coordinators via the expert group's 'google group' conversation. Moreover, it was known that a number of the stock coordinators were themselves unable to make use of the data prior to the expert group meeting. UKE had successive trouble uploading data to the system. Upload completed on 28/03/2014 - deadline.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1375	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	sol-eche: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day. Applies to UK-EW	LOW	TIMELINESS	UKE - had successive trouble uploading data to the system. Upload completed on 28/03/2014 - deadline.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1379	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	sol-nsea: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day	LOW	TIMELINESS	UKE - had successive trouble uploading data to the system. Upload completed on 28/03/2014 - deadline.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1395	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	tur-nsea: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day. Applies to UK-EW and UK-SCO	LOW	TIMELINESS	UK-SCO: Marine Scotland Science data were delayed as they were in late receipt of fishing effort data. This information was relayed to, and accepted by, expert group members and stock coordinators via the expert group's 'google group' conversation. Moreover, it was known that a number of the stock coordinators were themselves unable to make use of the data prior to the expert group meeting. UKE had successive trouble uploading data to the system. Upload completed on 28/03/2014 - deadline.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory

## United-Kingdom

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1398	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	tur-nsea: The collection of data needs to be continued in order to get a better understanding of the state of turbot stocks in the Northeast Atlantic. Priority should be given to improvement of catch-at-age information available from different countries and fleets. A fisheries independent index of abundance covering the whole stock area would improve the assessment of this stock.	HIGH	QUALITY	The UK collects data on turbot lengths and ages as part of its programme of randomised at-sea and on shore sampling, and from surveys. This 'issue' is another example of the sort of comment that would previously have been directed to the ICES PGCCDBS as it does not detail a failure against a Member State's agreed national programme or a failure thereafter to transmit data collected under a national programme. ICES needs to ensure it has an extant expert group to whom these sorts of comments could be directed rather than assuming them to be failures to fulfil a Member State's agreed DCF programme.	ICES comment is too general. MS answer is acceptable.This type of issue has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1412	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	bli-5b67: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGDEEP data call submission deadline, but until workshop day. Applies to UK-SCO	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	UK-SCO: Marine Scotland Science data were delayed as they were in late receipt of fishing effort data. This information was relayed to the expert group chair and was outside their control	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1413	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	whg-47d: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day. Applies to UK-EW	LOW	TIMELINESS	UKE - had successive trouble uploading data to the system. Upload completed on 28/03/2014 - deadline.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1420	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	alf-comb: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGDEEP data call submission deadline, but until workshop day. Applies to UK-SCO	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	UK-SCO: Marine Scotland Science data were delayed as they were in late receipt of fishing effort data. This information was relayed to the expert group chair and was outside their control	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1424	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	wit-nsea: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day. Applies to UK-EW	LOW	TIMELINESS	UKE - had successive trouble uploading data to the system. Upload completed on 28/03/2014 - deadline.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1428	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	wit-nsea: 2013 landings, discard and biological sampling data not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but submitted before workshop day. Applies to UK-SCO	LOW	TIMELINESS	UK-SCO: Marine Scotland Science data were delayed as they were in late receipt of fishing effort data. This information was relayed to, and accepted by, expert group members and stock coordinators via the expert group's 'google group' conversation. Moreover, it was known that a number of the stock coordinators were themselves unable to make use of the data prior to the expert group meeting.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory



United-Kingdom

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1433	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	bll-oth: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGDEEP data call submission deadline, but until workshop day. Appies to UK-SCO	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	UK-Sco: Marine Scotland Science data were delayed as they were in late receipt of fishing effort data. This information was relayed to the expert group chair and was outside their control	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1441	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	bll-nsea: 2013 landings not submitted in time to WGNSSK data call submission deadline, but until workshop day. Applies to UK-EW	LOW	TIMELINESS	UKE - had successive trouble uploading data to the system. Upload completed on 28/03/2014 - deadline.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1442	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGNSSK. EcoRegion: North Sea	bll-nsea: Fishery-independent surveys catch very few large brill, creating data gaps for the greater fish lengths. Commercial surveys could be developed to effectively monitor the full age and size spectrum of this species.	MEDIUM	QUALITY	The UK collects data on brill lengths and ages, across the length range caught, as part of its programme of randomised at-sea and on-shore sampling. This 'issue' is another example of the sort of comment that would previously have been directed to the ICES PGCCDBS as it does not detail a failure against a Member State's agreed national programme or a failure thereafter to transmit data collected under a national programme. ICES needs to ensure it has an extant expert group to whom these sorts of comments could be directed rather than assuming them to be failures to fulfil a Member State's agreed DCF programme.	MS answer is acceptable. ICES comment is too general and should not be adressed as an data transmission failure. This type of issues has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory
1453	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	bsf-nea: 2013 data not submitted in time to WGDEEP data call submission deadline, but until workshop day. Applies to UK-EW	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	Data call not clearly received - only resolved on 03/03/2014, data submitted 26/03/2014 - deadline 28/03/2014. There hasn't been any requirement in the past to provide nil responses or a 'no data' response.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1470	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCEPH. EcoRegion: NA	Cephalopods: data not delivered in time: survey data 2013 England and Wales, Discard data Wales, ALL data from France. Applies to UK-Sco, UK-EW	MEDIUM-HIGH	TIMELINESS	We do not understand this comment as it relates to UK Scotland. Data were delivered to the accessions email address on 30 May prior to the deadline of 3 June. UKE - data prepared and submitted to deadline. There hasn't been any requirement in the past to provide nil responses or a 'no data' response. Data transmission 02/06/2014. Deadline 03/06/2014	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1479	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	alf-comb: The general absence of data on species composition of the catches and biological parameters are important limiting factors for the knowledge of these fish stocks.	MEDIUM	QUALITY	This 'issue' is another example of the sort of comment that would previously have been directed to the ICES PGCCDBS as it does not detail a failure against a Member State's agreed national programme or a failure thereafter to transmit data collected under a national programme. ICES needs to ensure it has an extant expert group to whom these sorts of comments could be directed rather than assuming them to be failures to fulfil a Member State's agreed DCF programme.	This type of issues has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory

United-Kingdom

id	end-user	year	datacall	data	issue	severity	issue_type	ms_comment	stecf_comment	stecf assessment
1484	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGCEPH. EcoRegion: NA	Cephalopods: There is still a data clarification request process to be deployed in relation to: a) Species (even family level!) identification in the catches and landings (northern countries and France) b) Discards: more biological data related to cephalopods (already being collected by some countries). c) Discard data: sampled level for discard for submission. All data should be raised. applies to UK-EW and UK -SCO	MEDIUM	QUALITY	UK Scotland has clearly stated in covering notes that discarding of cephalopods does not occur for Scottish vessels. Even very small ones are landed. Perhaps another RCM task to consider how to achieve a more coordinated and consistent process for raising sample data to give fleet-based estimates for all species and fleets in a region, including cephalopods. An aspiration is to build this around the Regional Data Base. Requests for additional biological data collection must also consider what the data will be used for, what precision is needed, and what are the operational and costs implications. WGCEPH has a history of asking for very high resolution data without considering how this could realistically be achieved within existing national budgets.	MS answer is acceptable.	Satisfactory
1517	ICES	2014	ICES Recurrent advice	Expert group: WGDEEP. EcoRegion: Widely distributed and micratory stocks	gfb-comb: Discards were provided only by Spain, French, Denmark and Sweden, although the species is discarded by more fleets. Several shelf fisheries have a bycatch of juveniles which is currently poorly estimated. Discards reported do not cover the entire distributional area of the stock	MEDIUM-HIGH	QUALITY	This 'issue' is another example of the sort of comment that would previously have been directed to the ICES PGCCDBS as it does not detail a failure against a Member State's agreed national programme or a failure thereafter to transmit data collected under a national programme. ICES needs to ensure it has an extant expert group to whom these sorts of comments could be directed rather than assuming them to be failures to fulfil a Member State's agreed DCF programme. This should be addressed by RCMs as part of regionally-coordinated sampling schemes, to identify data gaps that are likely to have high leverage in assessments and advice, and propose feasible adjustments to programmes.	This type of issues has to be dealt with in a coordination forum and the outcome reflected in future NP and later in future data calls.	Satisfactory

- *Belgium*

**Annual Report**

As a recommendation for the future the MS is strongly requested to provide the AR and ST according to the guidelines.

- Economic variables

Often Planned sample/response rate is not calculated or do not correspond to figures in the tables. The information given in the text does not match with information in tables. Problems in identifying the reference year.

- Biological metier related variables

It is very difficult to really evaluate the level of achievement for Belgium (planned levels in the NP v's achieved levels in the AR). There appears to be no consistency between the defined sampling frame code and fishing grounds across the NP and the AR. Inconsistencies also exist between the text and the tables within the AR. Belgium appears to be using an old template for the DCF AR text, as it refers to reporting cv's, which is not necessary according to the revised guidelines, and also still has the title "Action to remedy shortfalls", instead of "Action to remedy deviations". The MS also has included details under "Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations" which are not necessary with Table II.B.2

There are some inconsistencies between Region and fishing grounds. The regions are wrongly reported. Confusions with metier and frame code listed when a comparison is attempted between the NP and the AR.

- Recreational fisheries

The text is not clear as to which species are currently covered by the sampling programme. No reference to completeness of the survey, or deviations mentioned nor explained. Similar comments were made last year (repetitive issue). The text in AR is confusing.

- Biological stock-related variables

All the regions are combined and reported together, this makes it very difficult to know what has been sampled in the various regions.

- Transversal variables

Not all transversal variables are listed. No derogations listed in table. Prices by commercial species not collected. No derogation requested or accepted.

- Collection of data concerning the aquaculture

Even if derogation is given for not sampling of aquaculture economic data, table should be presented fully! Entries should be yes, no or NS for non-sampling.

- *Cyprus*

**Annual Report**

- Derogations

MS claims to have requested derogation for the collection of data on the recreational fisheries but the request has not yet been replied by the Commission. This issue should be clarified in order to allow fundamental planning of the sampling obligations by the MS. Furthermore the MS inform that the National law prevents recreational vessels to catch sharks and Bluefin tuna but the reference given is of a document written in Cypriot.

- Biological sampling

It is not clear whether MS has a system of concurrent sampling in place. This doubt was already raised last year. (See AR template section C1 for 2013 and 2014). This may be the reason for the nonexistence of biological data for non-targeted species like small tuna as raised by ICCAT.

- Processing Industry

The enterprises included in the Annual Report from Cyprus go beyond what is the definition to be considered under DCF. COM Dec. 93/2010, defines the population as “ The population shall refer to enterprises whose main activity is defined according to the EUROSTAT definition under NACE Code 15.20: ‘Processing and preserving of fish and fish products’. This is an issue that is repeatedly flagged to Cyprus but so far has not been sanitised.

- Indicator 9 - evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem.

The MS was advised in last year’s AR assessment to request a derogation for the estimation of indicator 9 – Fuel efficiency of fish capture – given the MS has claimed that due to difficulties couldn’t estimate the indicator. However, the same situation is verified this year, i.e., there is no estimation of the indicators and none derogation was requested.

- *Bulgaria*

### **Annual Report**

- Economic variables

MS do not has a consistent approach to count number of vessels over the years. Once, MS counts inactive vessels plus active vessels and for another part, only active vessels. Also, the clustering needs to be consistent. This is impact economic variables and time series. FTE and fuel consumption are either missing or quite questionable. These are issues that are repeatedly flagged to Bulgaria.

- Biological variable

Issues are recurrent to fill in correct reference period. National Program and Annual Report are not consistent. Surveys are not usually well clarified and listed.

- Processing Industry

MS do not respect the guidelines to fill in tables. This issue is recurrent in the Bulgarian AR.

### **Data Transmission**

Issues arising with the data provided to the economic data call are repeatedly highlighted by the end-user (e.g. energy consumption and FTE).

- *Croatia*

### **Annual Report**

MS has a few minor issues about the format for presented information:

- Economic variables

Response rates are missing for some variables in the Table III.B.3.

- Biological metier related variables

Some metiers signed with asterisks in the Table III.C.1 but with no references. MS should to avoid duplicating rows for the same sampling frame. MS should to clarify how concurrent sampling is being applied at sea and on-shore.

- Recreational fisheries

Table III.D.1 not consistent with AR text and table I.A.1 where an approved derogation for eel and sharks is mentioned.

- Research surveys at sea

It should be clarified for MEDIAS survey: number of hauls planned was 50 according to NP, unclear percentages in column T (should be achieved/planned target and not related to maximum days eligible). Wrong reference to Annex II (which doesn't exist) in column N. MEDIAS Fish hauls and CTD stations not incorporated in map although referred to in Table III.G.

### **Data Transmission**

Croatia acknowledges the difficulties in estimating economic variables for the small scale fleets in several fleet segments (e.g. DRB VL0612, FPO VL0006, FPO VL0612, etc.). Specific measures have been taken to avoid these problems starting from 2015 data submission. However, 2013 data have been transmitted with incomplete data sets for several segments.

Effort data and Catch data (Landings, Discards) are inconsistent: large effort values in some years-areas-gears are accompanied by very low or no catches at all. MS stated that problems arise due to database procedures which were modified and improved resulted more consistent effort and catch data were received. Data for 2014 will be delivered according to the revised procedures. However, in order to avoid any problem (e.g. discrepancies, inconsistencies), for the next data call MS should resubmit not only 2014 but also the effort and catch data related to the 2013.

There are some issues with the JRC for MEDITS data reporting. Croatia submitted MEDITS data for 2013 in a data call as it became the member state in that year. Croatia performed the MEDITS survey from 1996 in GSA 17 jointly with Italy using Italian research vessel. All data from 1996 to 2012 were pooled and regularly sent by the Italian coordinator for GSA 17. It seems that Croatian data have been sent to the Italian coordinator for GSA 17 but not directly to JRC. The advice could be made to submit pertaining to MEDITS 1996-2012 surveys data to JRC for the scientific needs on the voluntary basis. However it should be taken into consideration that Croatia entered the EU in 2013.

- *Denmark*

### **Annual Report**

- Missing documents and information

The evaluators were missing a list of references, annexes, the complete copies of bi- and multilateral agreements. Also a list with RCM data calls and the specific STECF EWG to which data were provided was asked for. Starting from next year Denmark is requested to provide the link to the DCF-website. Denmark is further asked to explain why they haven't participated to the North Atlantic RCM meeting.

- Recreational fisheries

Results on eel and cod data collection in the section on recreational fisheries are missing. The evaluators ask for justification on the deviations from the National Programme for the species eel, cod and shark. MS is requested to add derogation on collecting recreational fisheries data for sharks to Table I.A.1

- Biological variables

In tables III.E for North Sea and Eastern Arctic Denmark may apply naming conventions. Furthermore, according section III.3 North Sea and Eastern Arctic the evaluators stated, that it seems to have been major issues with the targets set in the NP in terms of incorrect numbers being assigned or incorrect parameter targets for various areas. This is something to be mindful of when preparing the next NP submission. 8 out of 22 stock/biological parameters planned for sampling were under sampled.

In section III.C. – Baltic of the Annual report evaluators remarked, that although Denmark has moved to 4S sampling, they are encouraged to improve the logistics of their sampling plan, which appeared to be problematic in 2014.

Also from next year on, details of the data quality are requested that came up with the change of the sampling scheme.

For next year MS should ensure consistency in the tables of section III.C and include headings. Evaluators remarked on the tables III.C.6 that column C is empty, NP and AR reference year were missing, and metiers coding was not consistent with reference metiers list (DNK should not precede metier name). Data were provided for more metiers than planned in III.C.1. There is a mis-match between III.C.1, III.C.3 and III.C.6.

- Transversal variables

MS should ensure to not indicate sources for data which are not collected (i.e. effort data with approved derogation).

- Fleet economics

MS is asked to explain why 700 vessels are missing from the population and update the reference year by resubmitting table III.B.1, as well as mark clustered segments with an asterisk.

### **Data Transmission**

No unsolved issues were detected. Mainly end-users comments have not been sufficiently detailed and correct.



- *Estonia*

### **Annual Report**

- Regions

Description of the module C for the other regions than Baltic Sea is not in line with the DCF regions. The information about the North Sea and Eastern Arctic (Svalbard area) and North Atlantic (NAFO) fishing regions is mixed under subtitle North Sea and Eastern Atlantic, which is not in line with guidelines and DCF, therefore STECF was unable to fully assess the module C of Annual Report. MS is requested to separate and report Regions in-line with the DCF.

- Biological sampling

Additional test fishing surveys are foreseen in NP and used by Estonia to reach targets set for GNS and FYK gears. Test fishing cannot be considered as substitute for sampling of selected commercial metiers, therefore MS is requested to resubmit AR ST Table III.C.3 separating commercial and test sampling for identified metiers.

- *Finland*

### **Annual Report**

On table IIF1, the information on the variable “prices by commercial species” should be provided. This is an issue recurrent from previous years.

### **Data Transmission**

It should be clarified (and uploaded as soon as possible, if not done yet) when age data for salmon from the RDB (FishFrame) would be fixed and data re-uploaded to RDB.

There are some issues with the JRC for the Effort and Fleet economics data calls, for not reporting data (or reporting it clustered) for some segments with a low number of vessels. Tables reporting clusters since 2015 should help JRC to identify these clusters and where data is reported clustered.

For the Effort data call, JRC should be more precise in defining the variables requested and specifying the problems in data transmission with the MS. The MS should try to provide all data requested by the JRC in the correct format.

- *France*

### **Annual Report**

- Economic variables

Tables III.B.1 and III.B.3 should be resubmitted because of missing information for several segments/variables.

Only partial information is given for vessels operating in Other Regions and MS is referring to lack of resources and methodological difficulties. MS should take actions to collect complete data. MS should also provide description of quality of data collected. Deviations should be explained and justified and actions to avoid them should be described.

- Biological metier related variables

MS should follow the agreed naming convention for the Region. MS should resubmit the complete set of III.C tables provided according to the guidelines. MS is also requested to update the text accordingly when necessary.

- Recreational fisheries

The text is given for all regions together against the guidelines. Ms is requested to provide text by region and resubmit the module for the Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic. In region North Atlantic Ms is requested to provide text on eel in inland waters, on 2014 data for seabass, information on data quality and resubmit the module.

- Biological stock-related variables

The species are not presented consistently in the tables III.E.1-3, which makes it difficult to evaluate the sampling scheme and achievements. MS should resubmit the complete set of III.E-tables in the Regions North Sea and Eastern Arctic, North Atlantic and Other Regions and adjust the text accordingly when necessary. In the Regions Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea and Other Regions, the explanations and justifications for deviations are not explained and therefore MS is requested to resubmit the text or take actions to avoid this in future.

- Transversal variables

The table III.F.1 is missing several effort variables and MS is requested to resubmit the table. If MS has failed or is unable to collect the data, either a sampling programme has to be implemented or derogation has to be requested.

- Collection of data concerning the processing industry

Table IV.B.2 is missing information on number of enterprises and is not filled according to 2015 guidelines. MS is requested to resubmit the table.

- *Germany*

### **Annual Report**

The overall execution of the Annual Report 2014 exercise was performed very well. Minor issues are related to the fact that MS has not strictly adhered to guidelines. The majority of these issues can be dealt with in the next annual report. However, MS is request to align and resubmit two tables related to derogation on recreational fisheries for cod. The issue is further detailed below. In 2014 there was some under-sampling of certain metiers, for which MS has given sufficient justification, however MS should endeavour to reach targets in future programmes.

- Recreational fisheries

Column G in Table III.D.1 (Approved derogation) is not in line with Table I.A.1 as derogation on cod in NS&EA pending. MS is requested to align Table I.A.1 and column G in Table III.D.1

### **Data Transmission**

There is some redundancy of the information requested by end-user from MS and there are no outstanding issues regarding data transmission failures.

Regarding most issues MS has given satisfactory justification and these issues can be considered resolved.

Baltic: age data for eel (*Anguilla anguilla*) in reference years 2009-2013

Missing data on commercial landings and commercial effort for reference year 2009 and missing data on commercial samplings for reference years of 2009-2010.

- *Greece*

#### **Annual report**

MS AR's quality largely improved from last year. MS is fully encouraged to enhance AR's tables according to the guidelines (e.g. III.B.3, III.F.1, IV.A.3).

For Aquaculture data collection (Module A), MS is requested to fulfil tables IV.A.2 and IV.A.3 according to guidelines and resubmit the text of the AR.

EWG recommend MS to report all metiers operating in all GSA in the table (III.C.1).

#### **Data transmission**

There are some unresolved issues related to inconsistencies between Effort and Catch data (issue n°471). MS is requested to provide the table in order to fulfil the JRC Med&Black Sea request.

- *Ireland*

#### **Annual Report**

Only some minor issues in the MS's AR as the use of NP 2014-2015 instead of NP 2014-2016 as roll-over period, and the merging of the regions North Sea and Eastern Arctic/North Atlantic at III.E. tables. "Region" should be filled in accordingly to the guidelines and be consistent across all III.E tables.

#### **Data Transmission**

There are some unresolved issues related to missing of data on fleet economics and fishing effort in vessels < 10m as well as capital value for inactive vessels.

EWG15-10 felt unable to judge the MS's response and has requested that DG MARE investigate 2 issues related to provision of data on small tuna species, and missing length data for Nephrops

- *Italy*

#### **Annual Report**

- Biological sampling metier related

Italy reported fishing activities in Med& Black Sea and it has one vessel active in CECAF. Considering that MS fishing effort in CECAF is negligible (RCM LDF 2013 agreed on this), and as it was suggested for several years, it would be clearer if derogation has been requested and approved by EC or through an RCM LDF agreement. Last Year MS reported "ready to

contribute to an international sampling programme implemented under the RCM\_LDF umbrella” but apparently any effort was done to be involved in the existent multilateral agreement signed by some counties involved in fishery.

- Recreational fisheries

From information provided in the text and tables, it is not clear if data on shark’s recreational fishing are available and not presented, or not available at all.

From the text it is clear that Italy has established a program in line with European Plan of Action for Cartilaginous fishes. Nevertheless, although the transmission of this data to ICCAT is mandatory, Italy states that “no data on shark’s recreational fisheries had been stored”.

- Biological sampling stock related

Some minor issues related with consistency among tables can be solved in next AR.

- processing industry

Some clarifications are needed about sampling scheme for number of employees since it is a raising factor.

### **Data Transmission**

Although is not mandatory to provide the data collected before DCR entered in force, scientifically having the best data series available is desirable in order to provide the best assessment and advice. So, all countries should be invited to submit the entire available series of data to the assessment groups.

- *Latvia*

### **Annual Report**

- Economic Variables

Segment named "self-consumption coastal fishery" is excluded from the economic survey although it represents 48% of total number of vessels in the fleet register. There is no derogation concerning the sampling of the segment. This issue should be clarified in order to allow fundament planning of the sampling obligations by the MS.

### **Data Transmission**

Age data for eel (*Anguilla anguilla*) in the Baltic missing for the period 2009-2013. Latvia has collected the otoliths but no age reading was performed due to lack of equipment and expertise. MS already guaranteed staff training in age determination, purchased otolith slicing equipment and plans to start age determination of eel in the nearest future. EWG strongly encourages MS to process otoliths providing the required age data.

- *Lithuania*

### **Annual Report**

- Derogations

For Biological related stock variables in North Sea and Eastern Adriatic MS achievements are partly consistent with NP. Deviations explained and justified with exception of age data on *Sebastes mentella*. MS should apply for a derogation to sample *Sebastes mentella*, providing

supporting information from the chairs of Arctic Fisheries Working Group (AFWG) and Join NAFO/ICES Pandalus Assessment Group (NIPAG). This derogation can then be included in future AR's.

- Biological sampling

Concurrent sampling was applied being dependent on self-sampling in small Pelagic fishery (herring and sprat) and might not be optimal. Achievements mostly consistent with NP as: 2 of the 5 planned metiers were under sampled slightly, 1 metier was over sampled and the targets were achieved for the remaining metiers. Issues mostly with the metiers targeting cod, because of reduced catches. The number of planned and achieved trips is not the same. There are 50% of the pandalus planned sampling targets for length. There are no results presented in the AR, and no information on achieved sampling on Cod, Salmon or sharks is provided.

- Economic variables

In future reports MS should follow guidelines on reporting clustering segments for data collection

- Indicator 9 - evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem.

MS relevant reports only concerning indicators 5- to 7. No surveys in the NS&EA and NA regions, so no data collection on indicators 1-4 in these regions possible. Not clear why time lag is always 13 months; further explanations are needed.

### **Data Transmission**

Due to methodological issues MS failed to report in time data on landings and discards. For some species as turbot these data should be improved. VMS data transmission failure recorded due to lack of knowledge on use programme for aggregation. MS advanced with scientific surveys at sea, comparing with previous reporting period.

- *Malta*

### **Annual Report**

#### **Overall compliance**

The overall compliance for the AR 2014 was assigned “Mostly” and compared to the year before an improvement is noticed since the Maltese AR 2013 was assigned “Partly”.

Modules in AR 2014 that were reported satisfactorily were “Transversal variables” and “Research surveys at sea” amongst others. Modules that particularly need improvement in AR 2014 are “Stock-related variables” and “Processing industry”.

- DCF website

If MS has implemented a DCF website, please provide the web address. If no DCF website is yet in place, it should be launched before the end of 2015!

- Derogations

In the sampling of the recreational fisheries, MS has derogation in place stating that they do not have to sample eel. MS might be recommended to also ask for derogation for sharks in line with the results from the 2005 pilot study stating that sharks are not caught in the recreational fisheries. This in case the results from the pilot project prove to be valid still.

- Biological sampling

In order to achieve the métier-sampling in NP, MS is supposed to perform both at sea- and on shore- sampling. However, most of the sampling is done on shore which is partly explained by the fact that the vessels were too small to accept observers. Here a solution could be to launch additional self-sampling programmes. MS is encouraged to further develop both the explanations and actions to avoid deviations in future AR. If it is not possible for MS to follow its NP, a revision of the programme has to be considered.

In AR 2014, it is not possible to evaluate the stock-sampling performed properly. This is due to that the planned number of individuals is missing. MS is therefore asked to resubmit parts of this section. In the future, MS should be aware that the latest version of the table templates always is used.

- Processing Industry

Data regarding the procession industry are not complete in AR and for data presented, the information on the data quality is missing. Therefore, MS has to complete and resubmit this module.

### **Data Transmission**

#### General

MS has satisfactory answered to many of the data transmission issues raised in conjunction with the recently launched data calls. To conclude, the problems identified are more associated with to the end user's definitions of the deficiencies than MS related.

- Improvement areas

Problems identified that need to be looked into further by MS include JRC's data call on Fleet economics where there are missing data at the level of fleet segment and where data on employment seem to be underreported.

- *Netherlands*

### **Annual Report**

- Economic variables

EWG found that no information provided on data collection activities for vessels operating in other regions. This will occur as data transmission issues in 2015. Data for other regions has to be collected, according to NP of Netherlands. No derogation exists. The same shortfall was observed in Eel data collection for aquaculture which is mandatory. EWG asks to clarify the data collection failures and take measures to ensure implementation of NP.

- Biologic variables

Confusing information for consistency of achievements with NP was provided regarding sampling of some stocks (III.C.) Therefore MS is asked to resubmit Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4 with supporting text clarifying which métiers are included in the "All demersal" sampling frame and clearly outline what sampling levels have been achieved. High deviation from planned target was observed in Biological stock-related variables, for example only 40% of targets were achieved for *Clupea harengus* and no detailed information in the text was provided. MS is encouraged to pay more attention to clarification of inconsistencies with NP in future.



### **Data Transmission**

- Economic variables

Regarding data collection and transmission, specific recurring issues regarding small scale fleet were observed. Failure to report data in 2013 was a result of insufficient response from small scale fleet to facilitate full coverage of data. In 2014 data call questionable quality data for several of the smaller vessel length groups were found and response from MS was based again on low statistical reliance of the results. Although MS states about attempts to overcome shortfalls, EWG strongly encourage considering the small scale fleet data deficiencies seriously and taking measures to satisfy DCF data quality requirements.

- *Poland*

### **Annual Report**

There are only minor issues in the Polish AR such as:

The reference year for transversal variables is incorrect.

The percentages for economic variables needs to be recalculated so as not to exceed 100% - this table should be re-submitted.

The two variables missing for economic data must be provided to allow assessment of compliance.

MS data on the processing industry (population and response rates) are unclear and need further explanation.

### **Data Transmission**

It is suggested if the MS is unable to provide completed final data in time for a data call eg if age data are not available in time, the MS should at least upload length data so that the WG can start assessments and age data can be added later when complete.

- *Portugal*

### **Annual Report**

- Bilaterals and co-ordination meetings

It is not clear if the bilateral agreement with Spain for NAFO areas is still valid. This needs to be clarified.

- Evaluation of the fishing sector

Mediterranean Sea – information relating to this area was highlighted as being missing from 2013 AR. MS is asked to provide in future AR data for the vessels operating in the Mediterranean Sea as a separate section.

- Economic Variables

Numbers in Table III.B.1 do not match with numbers in Table III.B.2 and there is missing data in Table III.B.3. MS is asked to clarify and re submit Tables III.B.1 – III.B.3

MS is asked to check the impact of switching from census to random sampling on time series data and report the findings in 2015 AR.

- Metier related variables

Region column should be filled in according to the guidelines. CECAF, ICCAT and IOTC are not regions, but are fishing grounds, and should appear only in Col E of table IIIC1. Regions is 'Other Regions'

- Recreational Fisheries in the North Atlantic

The text in the 2014 AR is not sufficient to identify if the new legislation relates to onshore or boat based fisheries, this is also the case relating to the new surveys. More species specific information as to data types collected is also needed.

- Transversal Variables

There has been a clear improvement in relation to data collection for <10m vessels. MS should provide a description of the estimation procedure for effort variables for vessels <10m as presented in the 2014 AR.

- Surveys

Captions of Figs. III.G.1(A) and III.G.1(B) refer to MEGS, while they should refer to Sardine DEPM.

- Evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture industry

Clams are not sampled according to Table IV.A.1, but according to NP and Table IV.A.2 it is the major segment in terms of population. MS needs to clarify the issue and to resubmit the Aquaculture Module, including text and tables.

- Evaluation of the economic situation of the processing industry

MS states in AR text, that Depreciation of capital is not collected under SBS, but it does not clarify where the data comes from. For other variables the data are estimated and the procedure is reported. The reported data collection scheme and data source for Depreciation of capital therefore seems to be wrong. The variable no. of enterprises is missing.

MS is asked to clarify and resubmit Tables IV.B.1 and IV.B.2

### **Data Transmission**

#### **GFCM Tasks 1.2 – 1.5**

Requested data should be submitted (i.e. following the requested aggregation, stratification etc.), in agreement with the GFCM Recommendation as also endorsed by EU regulation (EU Reg. 1343/2011). There is not a problem related to the confidentiality of the data. Moreover, these data are not disclosed to the general public following GFCM resolution 35/2011/2. However the end user should be more specific in defining the data deficiencies.

#### **ICCAT**

Data issues related to a new screening process and as long as these can be resolved before any DT requests for 2015 data this is not seen as a significant issue.

#### **JRC effort**

MS has to take appropriate measures to prepare and provide data in due time.

#### **RCM**

MS data failures were down to the database not being populated with all fishing areas. RDBFF administrators should add the missing areas to the database to prevent this occurring in future.

#### WCPFC

MS answer clearly stated that no data have been collected, and thereafter submitted, in 2014 for the single vessel operating in this area. Commission should judge in relation of this problem (no data submitted). MS will try to overcome this problem in 2015 and the proposed approach (e.g. self-reporting) is welcome.

#### ICES

Most of the perceived DT failures relate to end user general comments which are not specifically aimed at the MS. MS should take appropriate measures to prepare and provide data in due time where there is actual data collected under the NP.

- *Romania*

#### **Annual Report**

- Fleet sector economics

Reported number of vessels differs substantially between AR 2013, NP and fleet register. Ms asked to clarify and resubmit table III.B.1.

- Biological sampling

It is unknown if the concurrent sampling was applied due to limited number of species reported.

- Research surveys

MS reports logistic (financial) difficulties in organization of surveys, or shows that Bulgaria (2013 and 2014) did not fulfil bilateral agreement. Beside non-performance of 4th quarter pelagic survey, MS shifted time slot of 2nd quarter of pelagic survey to 3rd quarter raising a question of usefulness of this data for pelagic species stock assessment in Black Sea.

- Processing industry

Significant decrease in population number is noted (NP – 76, AR 2013 – 38 and 10 in 2014). Romania did not provide any explanation for this decrease or data discrepancy.

- *Slovenia*

#### **Annual Report**

- Derogations

Slovenia has no list of derogations related to DCF based on Commission Decision 2010/93/EU. For biological sampling for coast recreational fishing, MS assumed approved as NP was adopted but the request has not yet been replied by the Commission. This issue should be clarified.

- Biological sampling

Concurrent sampling is mentioned as the protocol chosen by MS for sampling at sea, but only 2 species (anchovy and sardine) are reported. MS must clarify how concurrent sampling at sea and on-shore is being applied because it is not clear whether MS has a system of concurrent sampling in place.

MS should better clarify the issue related to the under sampling and how MS intends to solve it for the future.

MS not following guidelines for table (e.g.IIIC1). Next year and onwards MS should submit the AR with all the tables fulfilled according to the guidelines.

- Recreational fisheries

MS should better explain the issues related to the recreational fishery to understand which data were really collected in 2014

- Research surveys at sea

Response rates could be wrongly calculated. MS is requested to correctly calculate the %achieved target in III.G.1 column T

- Collection of data concerning the processing industry

Calculation of achieved sample rate/planned sample rate is wrongly calculated.

### **Data Transmission**

Incomplete time series/data coverage of national fleet. No data on total effort, catch/landing, discard and by-catch value of fishing periods, group by-catch species, by-catch weight and number, and CPUE/LPUE. MS should provide the requested data (i.e. mean length, max and min length, etc.) at least for the main commercial species in the area.

- *Spain*

### **Annual Report**

EWG1510 would have appreciated if the report would be written in English. A machine translated version of the AR was available to the EWG.

- Bilaterals and co-ordination meetings

It is not clear if the bilateral agreement with Portugal for the NAFO-areas is still valid. This needs to be clarified.

Economic: Baltic Sea, North Sea, Eastern Arctic, North Atlantic

The planned and achieved sample number is very low and in some cases it might not be representative. MS is advised to increase the planned sample numbers in order to achieve statistically reasonable sample numbers.

- Biological sampling

For the North Atlantic Region some inconsistencies were found in the III.C table and text. MS is advised to re-submit a revised table according to the guidelines and amend the AR text if relevant. For the Mediterranean and Black Sea Region next year and onwards MS must submit the III.C and III.E table consistent with the guidelines, including the naming of regions and referring to MS participating in sampling and also provide information on actions to

avoid shortfalls. Furthermore, MS is advised to explain why *Sparus aurata* is not being sampled.

- Transversal variables

MS should provide energy consumption variable either in table III.B3 or in III.F1. Furthermore, a clear description of the estimation procedure for effort variables for vessels <10m and some information on prices are missing.

- Aquaculture and Processing Industry

For the aquaculture sector MS is advised to increase the planned sample numbers in future in order to achieve statistically reasonable sample numbers and to follow the guidelines regarding the calculation of quality indicators as well as to clarify the methodology for sample allocation to strata. For the collection of data concerning the processing industry Spain should ask for derogation regarding the collection of missing variables or implement an additional survey as other MS do.

- Management and use of the data

As in the year before all MARE data calls on effort, fleet economics, fish processing and aquaculture are missing in the table. MS is advised to resubmit the table fully completed with all data calls.

### **Data transmission**

To JRC: For a number of Data Calls failure of data transmissions were identified and not justified by the MS. Provisions should be made to avoid such type of failures in the future.

To RCMs: MS does not upload data to the RDBs as there is no legal obligation to do so. This is a political issue, which should be clarified by proper authorities. Issue is to be investigated by DGMARE.

- *Sweden*

### **Annual Report**

- Fleet Economics

There are a series of issues that lead to ask the MS to submit the section III.B., with corrected tables and details on clustering and the estimation of capital value and capital costs. MS is also asked to check discrepancy between fleet register and reported number of vessels.

- Recreational fisheries derogations

Table III.D.1 mentions derogations for eels and sharks. AR text mentions that recreational fisheries for eels and dogfish (the only relevant shark species) is forbidden by national law. MS is asked to insert derogations on eels and sharks in Table I.A.1

- Aquaculture sector

MS is asked to check and correct if necessary Tables IV.A.1-3, when necessary:

No information on quality indicators is given in Table IV.A.2. Collection scheme seems to be A and C in Table IV.A.3., this is not reflected in table IV.A.2.

- Processing Industry

Collection scheme A and C in table IV.B.2 is mentioned, in IV.B.1 only A is mentioned. Please be consistent.

- Minor issues

Information on prices by commercial species should be provided in the future. MS needs to clarify about the existence of a bilateral agreement SWE-DEU. MS needs to resubmit the text in section II.A. and explain the role of the partners involved.

### **Data Transmission**

- Minor issues

Missing data should be submitted to the RCM as soon as possible (if not done yet).

- *United Kingdom*

### **Annual Report**

MS's AR 2014 is generally of good quality, mainly for the modules dealing with data collection such as biological samplings (III.E and III;E), transversal variables (III.F) and surveys III.G.

EWG made however some comments on the following issues:

- Bilateral agreements

MS listed several bilateral agreements but without information on their characteristics. Some appear more verbal than formal. MS is advised to 'upgrade' them to more formal agreements and to provide information on their validity period.

- Fleet economic variables

MS did not fill the economic tables according to AR guidelines: reference year, naming conventions, sampled rates. Data on energy consumption are also missing (in III.B as III.F modules). So tables are to be resubmitted properly completed.

Otherwise MS did not provided in its AR text information on methods and assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs, whereas this requirement is specified in the guidelines.

Some of these EWG comments appear as repetitive. MS is asked to take them into account and to find solutions for solving them.

- Recreational fisheries

MS attention is drawn to the fact that exemption granted by EC for sampling recreational fisheries in 2014 will not be extended. So a sampling strategy should be implemented as of 2015, in order to ensure that the UK is complying with its obligations under the DCF.

- Aquaculture

MS attention is drawn on the inconsistencies between technical tables and AR text concerning sampling schemes implemented for data collection on aquaculture.

Some EWG comments on the quality of tables filling, and on the completeness of the information provided on methods used appear as repetitive from one year to another. MS is asked to improve the quality of its AR for section IV.A.



### **Data Transmission**

Why also ICES persists to multiply issues by administrative areas of the UK (England, Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland)? Especially when MS is required by DCF to report at national level. MS is able to identify these sub-regions via the geographical location of its sampling frames for metiers related variables and plans biological sampling at stock level for stock related variables, which is fully relevant considering DCF regulation.

MS seems to consider ICES DT issues as a priority (most of the MS replies were judged as Satisfactory by the EWG). But MS have also fisheries outside ICES areas and in that case, MS answers to “Long distance” RFMOs issues were often judged by EWG as Unsatisfactory. This fact was already highlighted in the 2013 EWG comments.

MS should investigate solutions (e.g. self-sampling) in order to overcome actual gaps in order to ensure it is complying everywhere with its obligations under the DCF.

## ANNEX 6 – COMMENTS/FEEDBACK FROM PRE-SCREENING

### AR pre-screening: General issues

#### *Fleet economics:*

- Assignment of energy consumption not entirely clear: It is listed in Appendix VI and might have to go into Table III.B.3, but at the same moment, it is characterized as effort variable, which is expected in Table III.F.1.
- Why “Region” in Table III.F.1” Instead of “Supraregion”? (Evaluation sheet does not provide distinction between regions)
- Naming of variable group and variable in Table III.B.3 from JRC delivery not consistent with Decision 2010/93/EU (“repair cost”)
- JRC delivery does not contain “number of enterprises”
- Template not optimal for addressing strange observations in tables (even though they might not violate AR guidelines). Moreover, cell missing for commenting on insufficient information in the text part (e.g. when information on PIM parameters is missing).
- There should be a common approach to evaluate differences between target and frame population.
- Split of Table III.3.B into supra regions is irrelevant for evaluation of tables. However, it might be useful for text part.
- MS are allowed to further disaggregate fleet segments. There should be some advice on nomenclature (e.g. Latvian case of self-consumption fishermen).
- Most MS do not provide figures on annual salary on which the estimation of “imputed value of unpaid labour” is based upon. The same applies to PCU when PIM is used for capital value estimation.
- JRC-AR routine from fleet economic call data should be somehow “empowered” in a way that pre-screening could be mainly skipped for related tables. In case of failure, MS will get a transmission comment anyway, which is more meaningful than comparing numbers and codes between tables.

#### Questions by the Commission:

**What checks are carried out by pre-screeners on the AR text and standard tables, including which columns in the standard tables are typically reviewed/compared with other information?**

#### Fleet economic data

- Comparison of vessel no with fleet register
- Compare response rates between IIIB1 and IIIB3
- Check against figures in NP
- Coding convention
- Reference year (n-1 ?)
- Comparison of target fleet (active and inactive) with data reported in STECF AER and in other sections of the AR (general description of the sector, Transversal variables)
- Comparison with guidelines (content of tables, definition of fields)
- Comparison of numbers in Table III.B.2 (clusters) with numbers in Table III.B.1 (target and frame population)
- Comparison of text with Table III.B.2 to check if a description of all clusters reported in Table III.B.2 is given
- Tables III.B.2 and III.B.1: sum of unclusterd and clustered segments

- Comparison of achieved sample versus planned sample (Table III.B.1)
- Response rate in Table III.B.3: not greater than 100%
- Naming of clustering vessels (comparison of Table III.B.1 with III.B.2)
- In case of changes in methodologies, analysis of NP and comparison with AR
- Table III.B.3: list of variables to check if all variables in Appendix VI of Decision 2010/93/EU are included
- In case of missing variables or missing fleet segments, check in Table I.A.1 if a derogation exists
- Supraregions: analysis of Table III.A.1 to verify in which supraregion the MS fleets operated
- Naming of segments in tables: comparison with Appendix III of Decision 2010/93/EU

### Transversal variables

- Analysis of Table III.F.1 for vessels < 10 m, in particular data source and achieved response rate
- Table III.F.1: list of variables to check if all variables in Appendix VIII of Decision 2010/93/EU are included
- In case of missing variables or missing fleet segments, check in Table I.A1. if a derogation exists

### Biological variables

- Tables should not include empty lines to indicate sections as it prevent efficient use of filters.
- Table III.C.3 should include both planned and achieved sampling level
- Table III.C.6 is not suitable to judge on sampling level for countries that have shifted or are in the process of shifting from quota-based sampling to probability-based sampling.
- Hard to compare AR Table III.C.3 with NP Table III.C.3, as the structures are different and it is therefore difficult to apply any automated comparison (e.g. UK = 122 lines). Sampling frame codes AR: Each line should contain only one single sampling frame code. This can result that for one métier, several lines are filled.
- Headings in Table III.C.3 are inconsistent with the content.
- How to assess the Data quality (C2. Results and deviation from NP proposal)? No quality measure (CV) is given in the AR template.
- It is not clear from the guidelines if the sampling frame code in Table III.C.3 can include more than one code in each line. Does “codes used should match in Table III.C.3 and III.C.4” (in guidelines) mean by line or by coding?
- Mainly, NPs are now obsolete and so are no more references for comparing planned and achieved tasks. Only updated technical tables under the new format defined by 2014 AR guidelines can be used as reference for evaluation of 2014 ARs.
- Standard tables: some MS had filters still active in some of the sheets or hidden columns. Some MS used old tables versions. Merged cells must be prohibited but some are remaining even in the reference tables sent to MS (disturbing when copy/paste, sorting by filters or applying automatic checking formulas.
- AR text: some MS used „shortfalls“ (new wording: deviations)
- Section III.G (surveys): some MS use different figures for planned target in the AR and NP, in a few instances higher figures in the NP than in the AR.
- 2014 AR Guidelines:

- Which naming convention for referencing NPs 2014: 2011-2013, 2014-2016, or 2011-2014 ?
  - Some naming or coding conventions were not enough precise: fishing ground, areas/stock, units as percentages ... So filters cannot be used between sheets.
  - Table III.C.1: A mandatory filling of column P “Name of metier to sample (Table III\_C\_3 column G)” should be an improvement for evaluating other tables of section III.C. by automatic checking formulas or filters (only mean to know quickly the final list of metiers to be sampled, by applying a filter).
  - For recreational fisheries (table III.D.1), it’s not enough clear what to mention in column F “acceptable”. Regulation is acceptable but the species cannot be present in the region. It’s not the same in term of evaluation. To be split in two column s would be more informative for evaluating approved or not approved derogations.
  - For recreational fisheries section, it’s not clear if MS must mandatory report on salmon and eel in inland waters (nothing about this issue in table III.D.1).
  - Tables section III.E: not enough information if species must be considered as species (national level) or stock level. That issue is particularly important in MED&BS region because stock level is GSA level, and some MS waters cover several GSAs but MS planned their sampling targets at national level and so not at stock level.
  - For section III.E, Other regions species are listed by several MS only for LPF (high migratory species) as relevant to ICCAT. But they are targeted in ICES areas. Cannot this species be listed in NA as for MED&BS with ICCAT mentioned as RFMO ?
- Questions addressed to EWG 15-10:
    - Section III.C: Sometimes no deviation mentioned by MS according to the low volumes of landings of certain metiers selected by the ranking system. But, according to Decision EU/2010/93, threshold for an exemption is only applicable for stock related variables and no more for metiers related variables. Is it correct?
    - Section III.C: same question. What to do when national metiers targeting coastal species not included in Annex VII of Decision 2010/93/EU are selected by the ranking system? Mandatory to be sampled or exemption?
    - Table III.C.4: is it correct to create several lines with the same sampling frame coding? For a frame, concurrent at sea and on shore can be reported on one line of the table, but other strategies (stock specific sampling) should be another line with a different code.
    - Table III.C.4: sometimes sampling frames appear very wide in term of geographical dimension. For example Ireland: sampling frame types S (South), W (West) and NW (Northwest) cover in fact all the NA fishing grounds. So table is very difficult to crosscheck with Table III.C.3.
    - In MED&BS region for section III.E, some MS selected species and planned sampling targets at national level and not at stock level as defined by GFCM (i.e. by GSA). But, if split by GSA, most of the time landings would be <200t and be entitled to apply exemption rules (so no data collected). What is the best?

## **Improvements of AR text template and guidelines**

*Biological variables:*

- Data quality is difficult to evaluate because no reference in guidelines are provided to MS for reporting, since table III.C.5 with CVs was deleted. So questions on potential deviations and their justification appear now useless.
- Concerning “Actions to avoid deviations”, standardized answers are a little bit frustrating for the pre-screeners. Because no arguments can be provided. It could be interesting and useful for the EWG to know in some words what MS proposes to avoid difficulties met and to have pre-screeners advices on their efficiency.
- With this structure of the AR template, it is difficult not only for EWG to judge the quality issue, but also for MS to report on the quality of the data. Moreover, there are a lot of discrepancies, among MS, on the way to report quality information: some countries have reported “data achieved”, some others have reported the “values (CV)”, some others only the “tools used to estimate the quality”, some others have mentioned only that they are “following the Decision 2010/93/EU” etc.
- The issue of derogations should be better and clearly investigated. A complete and detail list should be available both for MS and for end user (!!!). This should also avoid continuous requested of data (e.g. discards data) from end user side.
- Is it enough for a MS mentioning that a certain species is not fished (e.g. for recreational fisheries) to obtain exemption from collecting such data? Or should in any case MS request a formal derogation? If so, and without resubmit the NP, which should be the correct way to proceed?
- How could we judge when a MS in the AR text is saying that “this will not happen again” or “these issues have been resolved”?
- At present it’s not useful at all compare the olds NPs with the current ARs, there are too many differences in the planned activities!!

### Improvements of AR standard tables

- A drop-down menu in the heading of some columns should help the country in the compilation and the following evaluation (few examples: under column “Region” there will be the possibility to choose only among the regions as identified in Table III.A.1; under the column metier could be proposed the list of the metier, this list is decided at Regional level and from a drop-down menu MS could choose only the ones existing in each region).
- The structure of the Tables III.C.4 and III.C.3 should be revised. It is difficult to compare the planned activities with the achieved ones. I would suggest to have a single table, adding the following four columns to Table III.C.3:

Total No. of fishing trips during the Sampling year	Achieved no. of sampled fishing trips at sea	Achieved no. of sampled fishing trips on shore	Total achieved no. of sampled fishing trips (J+K)
---	--	--	---

In this way, you should reduce the errors and have immediately a comparison between the planned and the achieved trips. Moreover, with this structure we could avoid to have the problems of mismatch in the “Sampling frame codes”.

- We need an identification code (number or others) in order to identify the list of selected species in Table III.E.1. The same codes should be reported in Tables III.2 and III.3. It could be more easily to compare the species in all Tables III.E (this could also avoid the problems linked to the species or to the stock in the Med area).

### Detailed comments on standard tables:

- Table II.B.1: All relevant meetings should be listed, marking those that have not been attended. Not clear from the Guidelines that this should be case!
- Table III.C.1: name of the Region (column C) should match with the name of the regions reported in Table III.A.1. NAFO, Indian Ocean, Long distance etc. are not Regions!!
- Table III.C.1: name of the Metier at LVL6 (column F) should be in line with the agreement reached at Regional level (still there are some problems). If the metier has been selected (columns J, K, L) it should appear in Tables III.C.4 and III.C.3. It is important that all these columns remain mandatory.
- Table III.C.4: carrying out the evaluation, it is necessary that the Sampling Frame codes in Tables III.C.4 (column F) and III.C.3 (column H) must be consistent (and it was not always the case...). In many cases identified codes in Tables III.C.4 were different from codes in Table III.C.3
- Column P “Planned total no. trips to be sampled by MS” in Table III.C.4: the result should be the same of the sum of the columns N and O. The same should be for column K (total achieved no. of sampled fishing trips) in Table III.C.3: result should match with the total of columns J and K. Country cannot delete the “functions” present in these cells!!!
- In all tables, the columns cannot be merged by MSs!!!
- Table III.G.1: columns F, G and H should be updated to years 2014-2016 in standard tables template
- Table V.1 template: Full name of indicator 7 is: *Areas not impacted by mobile bottom gears* (underlined text was mistakenly truncated)
- Table VI.1: crosses in matrix usually not checked in detail, as Data Transmission is checked separately; review focuses then on the completeness of the listed groups and data calls. Column for aquaculture data should be added.

### Experience with automatic checking/using macros

- Table III.E.3 is the easiest to analyse with standardized formulas, as achievement rates are directly available (if planned targets are provided). To colour them by levels of achievement allows to see immediately if it the table for a given region/species is green/yellow/red... But on the thresholds to be included in conditional formulas, I disagree with Venetia proposal.
  - First No/Partly/Mostly/Yes are clearly define in the evaluation template and these thresholds must be the references.
  - Second, from my point of view, undersampling and oversampling are not to be analysed in the same way. Undersampling is a failure, when oversampling is very often achieved without extra costs and justified by improvement of stock assessments. In my formulas, I have six colours, from red (no), orange (partly), yellow (mostly) to green (yes) and two more intense greens (lightly and highly oversampled).
  - Third, the proposal does not solve cases where no quantitative targets are defined for species/stock but sampling nevertheless carried out.
- The challenge for table III.E.3 is also to crosscheck it with table III.E.2 which is defining species and variables to carry out during the reference year. I agree with Henrik that the only way is to apply filters and verify for each region and stock achievement in terms of variables updated.
- But a busy task is to evaluate consistency between tables III.C.4 and III.C.3. Now III.C.4 provides planned targets by sampling frames and table III.C.3 achieved numbers of trips by métier and sampling frames (if reported on several lines as required by AR guidelines). So you have to cross the two tables for having information to evaluate planned targets vs achievements data. If formats, naming and coding conventions on sampling frames and métiers are not kept between the both tables, it is not possible to crosscheck them. When a sampling frame is corresponding to one métier, automatic checking planned and achieved numbers of trips is easily possible but sampling frames must be sorted in the same way in the two tables. AR guidelines should define these sorting rules. But when sampling frames do not correspond to the planned sampling scheme (same sampling detailed by métiers in



III.C.4, or reported in III.C.3 as enlarged to other areas, merging several métiers, etc.), only evaluation by filters step by step can be applied.

- Consistency between III.C.3, III.C.1 and III.C.6 can be easily evaluated by filtering data reported on métiers, RFMOs and fishing grounds variables.
- Automatic checking between NP and AR tables should be possible if, as proposed by Henrik, all NPs and ARs are merged under the same format, and for example cells defining NP planned targets protected when submitting AR achievements. So any change could be identified between NP and AR of every MS.
- Don't think macros is the solution for crosschecking the ARs. I initially tried to come up with some automatic checks but chose instead to use filters and the combination of filters and automatic summarizing (the sum and the mean automatically made and shown in the bottom of the view when a column is marked).
- The reason to reject macros and various functions (e.g. *vlookup*) was first of all because any change in the format (made by the MS or by general update of the format (and both happens quite frequently)) will corrupt the checks. It might work this year but not next.
- Secondly, because most crosschecks are made between tables in AR and tables in NP and they have different names dependent on the MS. This makes the macro solution very unsuitable. Macros is only suitable for checking within a given excel file unless a complex system is set up.
- The best solution is a database containing the ARs and NP and maybe also macro data from the data calls in structured way. Based on the database, all types of crosschecks can be made independent of changes in the formats of AR and NP. It is easy add new checks, adapt checks to changes and new sampling strategies, automatically fit to a given MS specific sampling constellation etc.
- Macros could help the work of the pre-screeners in terms of harmonization and standardizations of the work, but should be maintained the possibility of insert the comments.

## **Evaluation of data transmission (data calls for fisheries/biological data)**

- The majority of the issues highlighted as “data transmission failures” and requiring comment from MS were in fact general remarks, or idealised scenarios (more discards data required etc.) from the assessment working groups (AWG), and not data transmission failures at all. These sorts of general remarks should not be copied from the AWG data tables, as they are addressed to no one in particular and have no real action proposed.
- There were also a few instances, where a data failure was identified for a specific MS, and despite the MS, to whom the issue was addressed, being named in the comment; this same comment was inexplicably also included as a data transmission failure for all MS to address.
- There were also several cases, where data was identified as not being submitted on time for a data call, yet the MS states that the data was supplied on time and they have the acknowledgement e mail to support this.
- It is really down to the chair of each Working Group to ensure that accurate information on data gaps are highlighted in the working group report. Ideally, the working group should be specific on what data was requested but not provided, the impact this had on the assessment and what action is required now. Specific issues should be addressed to named Member States to avoid all Member States receiving the comment as a data failure.
- New tool implemented by JRC very efficient and easy to use.
- Questions on quality : how one MS can alone answer to a regional (at stock level) question ? To define ways of progress must be one of the mandates of the end-user and working groups should propose for example pilot studies or improving protocols to be implemented.

- Feed back from end users should take in account the regulation in force. Enlarging the DCF perimeters with complementary data collection (surveys, new species not included in Decision EU/2010/93 or concerning recreational fisheries, etc.) should be addressed to Commission or RCMs/RCGs, not separately to MS.
- General comments of end users are a lack of time for pre-screeners if MS concerned are not well identified (see for example WGWIDE) and questions only addressed to them.
- On timeliness: end user must specify clearly if data were used or not despite data were not provided on time.
- End users should better detail the data missing (e.g. type, quality etc.). Some comments are too general!! For example, what does it means: “questionable data quality for all fleets and gear groups?” or “Coverage of 46%?” How does MS, and moreover EWG, judge on it?
- Clearly it is missing a feedback between end user and RCMs. A lot of discussions/decisions/recommendations carried out during the different RCMs, and in many cases endorsed by Liaison meeting, are not tackled at all by end users!! End user should be aware of these issues.
- There are some issues redundant...If a MS has not sent some requested data one year, because for any kind of reason they were not available, should we find the same issue repeated every year? e.g. Greece didn't carried out any activities due to administrative problems from 2009 to 2012. Consequently, they didn't collected data, they could not submit data and they will not submit it. Every year Greece will receive the same request? Is not possible to avoid this recurrence of not compliance? They will never have the opportunity to have those data!! (Other example could be the Corsica data prior 2008).
- How could we judge when a MS is saying that “this will not happen again” or “these issues have been resolved”? (This point is valid also for the AR)

## ANNEX 7 – COMPILATION OF COMMENTS/SUGGESTIONS BY MS

### Compilation of comments, suggestions and reflections (Section IX)

#### Belgium:

The use of drop down lists in the excel tables would limit the possibilities for recording data in certain columns. For example, the list of variables in the III.E.3 table could easily be put in a hidden spreadsheet and used as a drop down list in table III.E.3. This would greatly reduce the confusion encountered when completing the Tables.

#### Croatia:

As per results of the Workshop regarding transversal data held in Zagreb in 2014, and as MS experience in codes mapping procedures, it can be concluded that DCF is not fully aligned with the coding in the latest Master Data Register list available for the Control Regulation. In this regard, additional effort may be done in order to align the coding lists, as most MS use control data for transversal variables.

Additionally, there is a need to further describe certain variables and give guidelines to MS as to their calculation, for example the calculation of fishing days for passive and active gears, in order to harmonize reporting across MS.

During 2014, an issue arose regarding fleet clustering due to inconsistent clustering over the time period. The impact was incomplete/inaccurate time series analyses as well as unreliable resulting indicators used in the Fleet report, although Croatia strictly followed guidelines regarding the clustering procedure. As Croatia has a dynamic clustering procedure, in cases where a vessel changes its activity from one year to another inconsistently, it is directly reflected in the clustering. In the future other factors, such as landings weight/value or even a fishing pattern in a longer time period, could be taken into account when clustering such vessels, in order to get more homogeneous fleet segments and estimations with less variability. Clustering in order to keep time series could also be taken into account.

We would like to emphasize that the cooperation with JRC, in terms of JRC data quality reports, has greatly aided in improving the establishment of a data validation system and improved data quality in general.

Overall, we find it difficult to comply with all requirements and data call obligations during the first half of the year; however this may be the case as DCF is still in early stages of implementation in Croatia.

#### Germany:

##### *On modules IV.A and IV.B:*

It would be an advantage to have the standard tables with space for at least the mandatory information as in the standard tables in the years before. This could also avoid non-reporting of mandatory figures.

Tables IV.A.3 and IV.B.2 have no columns to provide “Coverage Rate” values.

#### Latvia:

Latvia considers that the proposed indication of the landing values (<200 t) in Table III.E.1 could be quite misleading for several species which have much lower landing values but for which Latvia collects the biological data. Thus such species as salmon, sea trout, eel, common whitefish and turbot has annual landings below 10 t and some species even around 1 t. Latvia proposes to present the actual landing figure.

#### Lithuania:

There is a problem to calculate „Days at sea” information as vessels master do not indicate this information in fishing logbook (aggregated by FAO sub-region). If vessel spent one day in several regions there is no way to calculate exact time spent in every area.

#### The Netherlands:

Report guidelines:

In the report template, there is overlap between section II.B.2 and chapter VII. Chapter VII can be deleted.

Tables:

- Table III.B.2 as provided didn't match the description in the guidelines. The comment field has been used to indicate the classification of the segments as requested.
- Table III.E.1. A header of this table to fill in the reference period, as requested by the guidelines, is missing. Also the example given is not in accordance with the format requested by the guidelines
- Table III.E.1. The guidelines request to list the average landings for each species and stock over the most recent 3-years reference period. For a number of reasons it makes no sense to present this in an Annual Report. This table is used for identification of stocks which need to be sampled. It therefore needs to be filled in or updated in the NP and not in the AR. As most NPs have been unchanged for a number of years, the reference period is older than the most recent 3 years. This is also the case for NLD. NLD proposes to adjust the guidelines.
- Table III.E.1. For the calculation of the national share in EU landings, all MS require for the requested reference period information on EU landings for all stocks listed in Appendix VII of Commission Decision 2010/93/EU. Instead of having this being sorted out by the MS, it would be preferable to provide MS with the information of the landings from a single source. This would avoid duplication of work by the MS and increase quality.
- Table V.1 The Code Specification in this table refers to the definition of environmental indicators to measure the effects of fisheries on the marine ecosystem in Appendix XIII of Commission Decision 2010/93/EU. NLD suggests to change this reference to the descriptors of GES.

Other comments:

- NLD requests to reconsider the deadline of 31 May for submission of the AR. Almost all data requests for 2014 and data analyses in international working groups took and will take place in the first two quarters of the year. This causes a high work peak in this period and problems in resource management to produce these data timely. In addition, in the same period, data need to be processed for the production of the AR. This increases the risk of not being able timely to comply with all requests. NLD therefore proposes to defer the deadline for the submission of this report to later in the year (e.g. August)

#### Portugal:

According to the Commission Regulation 665/2008, support of experts' participation in each scientific meeting shall be limited to a maximum of two experts per Member State (article 10). However, as some Working Groups remit for more than two stocks with assessment and of interest to the MS (e.g. WGBIE), it is often necessary to extend the national representation to more than two experts without DCF financial support. Portugal draws the Commission attention to this issue and suggests its amendment in future criteria for expenditure eligibility.

#### Romania:

After the 7<sup>th</sup> year of implementing such a programme, unfortunately, our comments, suggestions and reflections are all most as in the last year report for 2014; due to the fact the basic issues for the programme implementation/execution encountered are:

- There is a strongly need EC to undertake all opportunities to stress to the national authorities responsible for fisheries and aquaculture to adopt the necessary legal measures to avoid delays on financing the Programme and to ensure the appropriate conditions to achieve the objectives of EC under its internal and international obligations/commitments;
- EC should have a decisive role on fulfilment of the international coordination actions of the MSs, as stated in the DCF provisions (i.e. common research surveys at sea in the EU waters – in this case BG failed to fulfil the surveys on the EU community waters of the Black Sea); this role should be preserved in the new Regulation for DCMAP for the period 2014-2020);
- Chairman of the groups/meetings should inform in due time the national correspondents to ensure the transmission of the invitation for participation in due time to the meetings; so that the specialists involved in the implementation of the programme to be fully informed;
- EC to improve actions and to use the good practice and experience spreading among MSs either a Regulation, either a Decision requesting the translation in national legislation, as a subsidiary principle application, by the authority in charge, together with other national bodies (e.g. National Institute for Statistics etc.) internal rules aiming better collection of data from domestic actors in fisheries, specially in aquaculture and processing industry (the super markets are playing a huge role in Romania and they all most ignore their duty .....! on reporting in due time and without other special actions of the collectors);
- Also, there is a strong need to establish a list of type of data and/or metadata envisaged to be putted in regional data bases, the list of indicators for economic and social needs – Eurostat and DG MARE to strengthen and to accelerate their co-operation on this goal;
- EC should take decision on the establishing with GFCM the regional data base for Mediterranean and Black Sea, avoiding duplication of data transmission;
- Very important is: to be established the financial aspect related to the depository of regional data base– who is going to finance the running cost of such a data base;
- STECF should endorse the EWG recommendations on aquaculture and processing industry related to the all MSs to collect data to better be assessed those sectors at whole EU level, improving the reliability of analyses should be provide to the Conuncil and EP, as bases for political decision process.

#### Slovenia:

It would be very useful that the forms for submission of the data for data calls will remain the same for a few consecutive data calls. Also because of the changes in forms for submission we have some extra costs related to preparation of data.

#### Spain:

Stocks/zone division of the horse mackerel (*Trachurus trachurus*) which appears in the Appendix VII 2010/93 (does not correspond to the division of stocks applied in the Working Group's evaluation of the species since 2004)

#### Appendix VII: division

- Southern Stock = ICES viiic-ixa
- Western Stock = ICES IIa, IVa, Vb, VIa, VIIa-c, e-k, VIIIabde/X

#### ICES division since 2005

- Southern Stock = ICES IXa
- Western Stock = ICES IIa, IVa, Vb, VIa, VIIa-c, e-k, VIIIabcde/X).

Until these allocations at stock level are not corrected, can be no appropriate adjustments at the level of sampling.

Sweden:

In table II.B.2, for transparency, Sweden has included recommendations relevant for Sweden established in 2012, 2013 (if relevant for AR year 2014) and in 2014, even though if some actions will be taken in 2015.

In table III.E.1 in the new set of tables, it is only possible to refer to “share of EU landing %” which causes some problems. To get the figures from EU landings on a stock level is quite a hard task to achieve. The NP is based on share of EU TAC and AR should be as well. Therefore, the table III.E.1 refers to share of EU TAC. Sweden suggests that the table should keep both options. The reference years in this table, in the Swedish NP, are still 2007-2009 since the NP is a roll-over from 2011-2013 and that NP was prepared in 2010.

In table VI.I, a column for economic data on aquaculture is lacking. Sweden suggests that such a column is added, to report the transmission of those data.

United Kingdom:

In view of the substantial amount of expenditure spent on eels and salmon monitoring, under the DCF and the Eels Action Plan, Annex 2 to this report provides details about these activities in the UK.



Europe Direct is a service to help you find answers to your questions about the European Union  
Freephone number (\*): 00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11

(\*) Certain mobile telephone operators do not allow access to 00 800 numbers or these calls may be billed.

A great deal of additional information on the European Union is available on the Internet.  
It can be accessed through the Europa server <http://europa.eu>.

#### How to obtain EU publications

Our publications are available from EU Bookshop ([http://publications.europa.eu/howto/index\\_en.htm](http://publications.europa.eu/howto/index_en.htm)),  
where you can place an order with the sales agent of your choice.

The Publications Office has a worldwide network of sales agents.  
You can obtain their contact details by sending a fax to (352) 29 29-42758.

#### European Commission

EUR 27410 EN – Joint Research Centre – Institute for the Protection and Security of the Citizen  
Title: Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries. Evaluation of 2014 MS DCF Annual Reports & Data Transmission  
(STECF-15-13).

#### Authors:

#### STECF members:

Graham, N., J., Abella, J. A., Andersen, J., Bailey, N., Bertignac, M., Cardinale, M., Curtis, H., Daskalov, G., Delaney, A., Döring, R., Garcia Rodriguez, M., Gascuel, D., Gustavsson, T., Jennings, S., Kenny, A., Kraak, S., Kuikka, S., Malvarosa, L., Martin, P., Murua, H., Nord, J., Nowakowski, P., Prellezo, R., Sala, A., Scarcella, G., Somarakis, S., Stransky, C., Theret, F., Ulrich, C., Vanhee, W. & Van Oostenbrugge, H.

#### EWG-15-10 members:

CASTRO RIBEIRO Cristina, ADAMIDOU Angeliki, ARMESTO Angeles, AVDIC MRAVLJE Edo, BELL Margaret, BERKENHAGEN Jörg, BRIGAUDEAU Cecile, CARPENTIERI Paolo, DAVIDJUKA Irina, DE BOOIS Ingeborg, DEGEL Henrik, DIAS Marina, DINTHEER Christian, EBELING Michael, GUILLEN Jordi, JUNG Armelle, KAZLAUSKAS Edvardas, MOTOVA Arina, NERMER Tomasz, NI CHONCHUIR Grainne, PÖNNI Jukka, RADU Gheorghe, RAYKOV Violin, SABATELLA Evelina Carmen, STRANSKY Christoph, TÄRNLUND Susanne, ULLEWEIT Jens, VUKOV Ivana, WARNES Stephen, WOJCIK Ireneusz.

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union

2015 – 287 pp. – 21 x 29.7 cm

EUR – Scientific and Technical Research series – ISSN 1831-9424 (online), ISSN 1018-5593 (print)

ISBN 978-92-79-50554-6

doi:10.2788/069049

## STECF

The Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) has been established by the European Commission. The STECF is being consulted at regular intervals on matters pertaining to the conservation and management of living aquatic resources, including biological, economic, environmental, social and technical considerations.

## JRC Mission

As the Commission's in-house science service, the Joint Research Centre's mission is to provide EU policies with independent, evidence-based scientific and technical support throughout the whole policy cycle.

Working in close cooperation with policy Directorates-General, the JRC addresses key societal challenges while stimulating innovation through developing new methods, tools and standards, and sharing its know-how with the Member States, the scientific community and international partners.

*Serving society*

*Stimulating innovation*

*Supporting legislation*

doi:10.2788/069049

ISBN 978-92-79-50554-6

